DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 155 TM 820 867

TITLE	Summer School Pilot, 1982: Second Report to the Texas Education Agency.
INSTITUTION	Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
REPORT NO	AISD-ORE-82.25
PUB DATE	Nov 82
NOTE	151p.; Many pages are marginally legible due to small type. For related documents, see TM 830 770-772.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Check Lists; Educational Assessment; Elementary Education; Grade Repetition; *Longitudinal Studies; Parent Attitudes; Pilot Projects; *Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs; School Districts; *Summer Programs; *Summer Schools; Supplementary Education; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Austin Independent School District TX; Test Revision

ABSTRACT

This technical report documents staff and parent reactions to the 1982 Austin (TX) Independent School District summer school for retainees, provides data on fall teachers' assessment of retainee skills, and describes the nature of the long-term comparison group. A summary of this information plus appendices detailing the purpose, procedures, and results for each information source are included. The appendices (labeled H-N) included are: (1) director survey; (2) teacher survey; (3) parent survey; (4) teacher checklist; (5) staff comments; (6) long-term comparison group, and (7) mastery tests revised. The First Report to the Texas Education Agency regarding this program was issued in September. Long-term achievement effects will be discussed in the forthcoming technical report on retention. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236155

SUMMER SCHOOL PILOT 1982: SECOND REPORT TO THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

NOVEMBER, 1982

TM820867

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F Hilly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

DISTRICT NO. 227-901

CONTACT PERSONS:

Nancy B. Schuyler
Evaluator, District Priorities

John MacDonald
Evaluation Intern
Summer School Pilot

6100 Guadalupe, Box 79
Austin, Texas 78752
(512) 458-1228

SUMMER SCHOOL PILOT 1982: SECOND REPORT TO THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

NOVEMBER, 1982

APPROVED:

Freda M. Holley

Freda M. Holley, Ph.D.
Director, Research & Evaluation

SUBMITTED TO:

Office of Planning
and Research
Texas Education Agency

Publication Number 82.25

82.25

Technical Report ABSTRACT

Title: SUMMER SCHOOL PILOT 1982:
Second Report to the Texas Education Agency

Contact Person: Nancy Baenen Schuyler

No. Pages:

Summary:

This report documents staff and parent reactions to the 1982 summer school for retainees, provides data on fall teachers' assessment of retainee skills, and describes the nature of the long-term comparison group. A summary of this information plus appendices detailing the purpose, procedures, and results for each information source are included. The appendices included are:

Appendix H: Director Survey
Appendix I: Teacher Survey
Appendix J: Parent Survey
Appendix K: Teacher Checklist
Appendix L: Staff Comments
Appendix M: Long-term Comparison Group
Appendix N: Mastery Tests Revised

The first report to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) on this program included appendices A through G and was issued in September (see ORE Publication Number 82.04). Long-term achievement effects will be discussed in the technical report on retention to be issued next spring.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary		1
Appendix H*	Director Survey	H-1
Appendix I	Teacher Survey	I-1
Appendix J	Parent Survey	J-1
Appendix K	Teacher Checklist	K-1
Appendix L	Staff Comments	L-1
Appendix M	Long-term Comparison Group	M-1
Appendix N	Mastery Tests Revised	N-1

*Appendices A - G are included in the First Report to the Texas Education Agency (ORE Publication numbers 82.04 and 82-F) submitted in September.

SUMMARY

Project Title: Summer School Pilot Project

Contact Person: Nancy Baenen Schuyler

Major Positive Findings:

- Generally, the summer school directors, teachers, central staff, and parents had positive feelings about the summer school program.
- The summer school features rated most highly were the reading and math curriculum, the schedule, the small classes, the rewards, and the organization of the program.
- Corrected reading mastery percentages indicated that 36 of the 37 required units were mastered by at least 80% of the students. A total of 23 were mastered by 90% of the students or more. In math, specified units were mastered at an average level of 87%.
- The fall teachers of 1981-82 retainees were asked to rate the reading and math skills of the students compared to others in their classes. Those who attended summer school were less likely to be rated low and more likely to be rated average in both reading and math.

Major Findings Requiring Action

- Staff believed enrollment should be closed by a set cut-off date, preferably one week before the end of the regular school year, but definitely at least one week before the beginning of summer school. Numerous problems related to planning, inservice, transportation, materials and supplies, teaching, student learning, and student adjustment could be avoided with an early enrollment cut-off date.
- Summer school staff also felt the strengths and weaknesses sheets completed by the regular school year teacher should be passed on to the summer school teacher. Some stated that this information on skills would be as helpful as that provided by the telephone calls to the former teachers. Also, the former teacher's name and telephone number should be listed on the student enrollment card to ease necessary contacts.
- The reading objective should be examined along with the curriculum and the students served by summer school for possible adjustments next year. Despite the fact that all units except one were mastered by at least 80% of the students, the reading objective was met only at the sixth-grade level. The objective stated that 90% of the students would master all required units.

WHAT WERE THE MAJOR FEATURES OF THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM?

All elementary students retained at any point were eligible to participate. A total of 1,193 students were enrolled and attended for at least part of the five-week session. Approximately 25% of those enrolled received special education services in 1981-82. A total of 77 teachers participated, with most teaching either two reading or two math classes.

The summer school schedule included 90 minutes of reading instruction, 60 minutes for a break for snack and community school activities, and 90 minutes of math instruction. The Chicago Mastery Learning Reading system (CMLR) and other supplemental materials were used in reading for most students; three classes of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students were provided with a wide variety of English and Spanish material . The math curriculum included the Math for Everyone series plus Succeeding in Mathematics workbooks and calculator enrichment. The Community Schools offered a variety of indoor and outdoor activities in arts and crafts, table games, physical education, and other skill areas.

Teachers were asked to call some of the students' former teachers and visit the homes of some students to increase the information they had on students before the program began. General and specific follow-up activities were also sent out to encourage continued work in reading and math after summer school ended.

HOW DID STAFF AND PARENTS FEEL ABOUT THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM?

In general, staff and parents were very positive about the summer school. Surveys were sent to all of the teachers and directors of the summer school during the last week of the session; parents were surveyed after all follow-up activities had been sent out, and central staff, directors, and selected teachers met in October to discuss program strengths and possible improvements for next year.

The staff surveys and meeting revealed that staff liked almost all features of the summer school. Directors rated the quality of the staff, rewards, math and reading curriculum, and organization at the school level most highly. Teachers gave the highest ratings to their schedule and planning time, rewards, and pupil-teacher ratio. Specific findings on the curriculum were that:

- Over 80% of the reading teachers rated the quality and appropriateness of the reading curriculum as excellent or good. Teachers believed the CMLR and Scholastic Text Extenders should definitely be used again.

- Over 65% of the math teachers rated the quality and appropriateness of the math curriculum as excellent or good. Teachers especially liked the Math for Everyone materials and the calculators. Although 54% of the teachers believed Succeeding in Mathematics should be used again, a number of teachers thought that a workbook that correlated better with Math for Everyone should be sought.

- One LEP reading teacher rated the quality of the materials excellent while the other rated them adequate. Both felt the same materials should be used again.

- The community school activities were generally seen as providing a necessary break for students and staff. Suggestions for next year included increased funding to allow a lower pupil-teacher ratio, shortening the length of the break for community school activities and snacks, and staggering the times at which students take their break.

Most teachers rated the information gained through home visits and telephone calls to former teachers as useful in planning student instruction (88% and 86%, respectively). Some teachers commented that information gained through telephone calls to former teachers could be provided, to a large extent, by the strengths and weaknesses sheets filled in on current retainees by the teacher in the spring. These were not available to the teachers this summer.

Most staff felt strongly that enrollment must be closed before summer school begins. The preference was a cut-off date of one week before the end of school. Some felt it would be manageable to close enrollment one week before summer school begins, although this deadline would make it very difficult to secure complete information from the cumulative folder on those students enrolling after the regular school year ends.

Both the students and staff suffered from problems caused by the numerous late additions this summer. Many aspects of planning were more difficult, including enrollment procedures, placement of students, transportation, and ordering of supplies and materials. Inservice had to be repeated twice due to late hiring of extra teachers and directors, and some teachers were even hired too late for the second sessions. Many teachers felt they were not as prepared as they would like on the first day due to uncertain class rosters and lack of some materials. On the average, teachers had three students added after the first day. It was difficult to find time to help late additions adjust to the routine and catch up, little information was available on their skills, and it was difficult to pace instruction for all of the students. Regrouping was sometimes necessary. These problems could be avoided with a definite enrollment cut-off date next year.

Overall, the staff considered the summer school a very worthwhile program. The staff's enthusiasm and positive attitude, the reward systems, the smooth operation of the classes, and the high attendance rate were viewed as major strengths of the program. Possible improvements for next year include carbonless multiple copies of strengths and weaknesses sheets so summer school teachers could receive a copy, an earlier enrollment cutoff and shorter bus rides for some students if possible. The possibility of limiting enrollment to current retainees or those strongly recommended for it or excluding integrated special education students due to their special needs will also be considered.

Parents rated the summer school highly, with 44% rating it "wonderful" and 43% "pretty good." Only 14% rated it "okay" with only one parent (1%) saying summer school was "not very good." Features rated most highly were the math and reading classes, the small size of the classes, and the fact that children learned to use a calculator. Most parents (over 70%) thought the length of the school day and the length of the overall session, and the timing of summer school at the beginning of summer were great. They reported that their children liked the classes, teachers, and other students. About 82% felt home visits were a good idea for future summer school programs.

Parents were asked about follow-up activities received and completed. Of those who received specific instructions for activities weekly, nearly 75% completed at least one activity. In math, those who received specific instructions weekly were more likely to complete activities than those who received general instructions once on the last day of class.

WHAT DID STUDENTS LEARN THROUGH SUMMER SCHOOL?

In reading 36 of the 37 required units were mastered by 80% of the students attending summer school. A total of 23 units were mastered by 90% or more of the students. These results are much more encouraging than those reported in the first report to TEA and reflect corrected mastery percentages.

In math, students mastered specified skills at an average level of 87%. This exceeded the objective of an 80% average mastery level.

Thus, students showed good mastery of the reading and math skills to which they were exposed during summer school.

The new fall teachers were asked to rate the skills and behavior of retainees who did and did not attend summer school compared to other students in their classes. Results indicated that the 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school were less likely to be rated "low" and more likely to be rated "average" in terms of reading and math skills than those who did not attend summer school. However, the 1980-81 retainees who attended summer school were rated low in math and reading skills slightly more often than those who did not.

It seems that the 1981-82 and 1980-81 retainees had somewhat different characteristics. This could be because they were retained under different policies or because of the difference in length of time since the retention occurred. The fact that 1981-82 retainees seemed to benefit in skills somewhat more than the 1980-81 retainees may mean that those retained prior to 1981-82 generally benefitted a little less from the summer program or that those who attended from this group had much poorer skills than those who did not.

Summer School Pilot Project

Appendix H

DIRECTOR SURVEY

82.25 Instrument Description: Director Survey

Brief description of the instrument:

The Director Survey contains 19 items designed to assess summer school directors' perceptions of the quality of the summer school and community school programs, and to solicit suggestions about methods of improving these programs. A copy of the survey is contained in Attachment H-1.

To whom was the instrument administered?

All five directors of the summer school program were sent the survey.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

When was the instrument administered?

The survey was mailed out through school mail on July 7, 1982, during the last week of the summer school program.

Where was the instrument administered?

Directors completed the survey at their schools or other location of choice.

Who administered the instrument?

Self-administered.

What training did the administrators have?

N/A.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

There are no known problems with the instrument. Although all directors returned the survey, four surveys were returned within a week of the mail-out; the fifth was returned three weeks after summer school ended.

Who developed the instrument?

Office of Research and Evaluation staff.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

11

DIRECTOR SURVEY

Purpose

The Director Survey was administered to gather information regarding the following decision and evaluation questions:

> Decision Question D2: Was the structure of summer school appropriate for future summer schools? Are alterations necessary?
>
> > Evaluation Question D2-1: What training did staff receive? Did the staff feel the training was effective?

In addition, the Director Survey was designed to assess school directors' perceptions of the general quality of the summer school program, their perceptions of the quality of the community school program, and to solicit their suggestions about improvements needed in the summer school program.

Procedure

The Director Survey was designed by ORE staff and distributed to the five summer school campus directors by school mail on July 7, 1982 during the last week of the summer school. The survey contains 19 items and is contained in Attachment H-1. All of the surveys were returned.

Directors' responses to scaled items were tallied by hand. The complete survey with tallies is contained in Attachment H-2. Directors' responses to open-ended items are contained in Attachment H-3.

Results

Evaluation Question D2-1: What training did staff receive? Did the staff feel the training was adequate?

Most directors rated their training as adequate in all areas assessed; that is, in the reading and math curriculum, in procedures for making home visits and phone calls, in assigning students to classes, in record-keeping requirements, and in setting a daily schedule. Two directors, however, thought their training was inadequate for dealing with record-keeping requirements and for setting the daily schedule. For one of these directors, the training problem was perceived as existing because he was hired late. The other director did not believe he was well-prepared for the record-keeping tasks because record-keeping requirements were "constantly changing."

In addition to the above evaluation question, the Director Survey was used to assess directors' perceptions of: the quality of the program in general, the timing of summer school, several enrollment issues, the quality of the community school activities and the relationship of these activities to summer school, and ways to improve the future summer school programs.

General Quality of the Summer School Program: The directors generally rated all aspects of the summer school program as "adequate" to "wonderful." Figure H-1 lists the aspects of summer school rated by the directors according to the mean ratings given to each. The directors were unanimous in describing the quality of their staff as "wonderful." The calculator rewards and the curriculum were also rated very positively. Least highly rated by the directors were the LEP curriculum (which was rated by the only director whose campus had LEP classes) and the amount of time teachers had for planning and scheduling. It is interesting to compare the low rating directors gave to teacher planning time, and the higher rating that teachers themselves gave to this (see Appendix G); teachers appeared to rate the amount of time they had for planning as being one of the good things about summer school, whereas the directors were concerned that teachers had too little planning time. Actual planning time did tend to be less than originally planned due to unanticipated responsibilities that teachers needed to take on.

MEAN RATING	ASPECT OF THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM
1.00	Quality of the staff
1.16	Rewards (calculators)
1.20	Organization of the school
	Math Curriculum
	Reading Curriculum
1.25	Rewards (scented stickers)
1.40	Pupil/teacher ratio
1.40	Local Budget
1.60	Effectiveness in Improving Students' Skills
1.80	Teachers' Schedule and Planning Time
2.00	LEP Reading Curriculum

Figure H-1. MEAN RATINGS OF DIRECTORS TO ITEM ON GENERAL REACTION TO SUMMER SCHOOL. RATINGS WERE 1 = "WONDERFUL," 2 = "ADEQUATE," AND 3 = "INADEQUATE."

The Timing of Summer School: All directors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: "Summer school works best when scheduled at the beginning of the summer."

Enrollment Issues: Several issues concerning enrollment were expressed informally by teachers and directors, and were therefore included in both the Director Survey and the Teacher Survey. These issues included: At what point should summer school enrollment be closed? What is the effect on instruction of having late enrollees arrive? What kind of information about students should have been available to teachers and directors but was not? Were there any non-retainees attending the summer school?

All directors were unanimous in believing that summer school enrollment should be closed at least a week before the summer school begins. Some suggested that it be closed the last week of the regular school year. Having summer school enrollment open as late as it was resulted in less time available for teacher planning and late arrival of extra materials.

All but one of the directors believed that the student data cards did not provide enough information to teachers. If summer school teachers are to make phone calls to a student's former teacher, the cards need to contain the former teacher's name and phone number. One director wrote that students' cumulative folders are needed. Three of the five directors did not believe that the lack of information had any harmful effects. The two directors who did believe the lack of information was harmful were not specific about the nature of those effects.

All directors stated that, to their knowledge, no non-retainees were attending summer school. One director stated, however, that he would have had no way of knowing if a student was not retained at some point in his or her school career.

The Community School: The directors were in general agreement that community school activities were well-planned and organized, that the children enjoyed the activities, and that the activities gave students a needed "break." However, several directors expressed a problem with providing supervision during the community school time. They suggested that community school teachers be more adequately trained in managing groups of children, and that time in recess or outdoor play should be shortened to less than thirty minutes.

General Comments: What the directors generally liked best about the summer school were the rewards given to the students, the quality of the staff and of the curriculum, and the small size of the classes. Directors stated that some problems that were encountered could be alleviated in future summer schools by more advanced planning (particularly with regard to supplying materials) and by closing enrollment early. Complete comments are shown in Attachment H-3.

82.25

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

SUMMER SCHOOL DIRECTOR SURVEY

As directors, you have the best view of how the summer school worked on your campus. We need your help in identifying strength and weaknesses in this year's summer school program. Please respond to the questions listed below. Feel free to add comments on the survey or call Nancy Baenen or John MacDonald with them at 458-1228. Individual responses are confidential. Results will be reported for directors as a group. Results should be summarized in September and will be circulated to all appropriate parties.

1. GENERAL REACTION TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM: (Circle appropriate numbe-)	WONDERFUL	ADEQUATE	INADE-QUATE	DON'T KNOW
a. Organization in your school	1	2	3	4
b. Effectiveness in improving student's skills	1	2	3	4
c. Teacher schedule and planning time	1	2	3	4
d. Pupil-teacher ratio	1	2	3	4
e. Rewards (calculators)	1	2	3	4
f. Rewards (Scented stickers)	1	2	3	4
g. Other rewards (specify any you especially liked)	1	2	3	4
_____				
h. Math curriculum	1	2	3	4
i. Reading curriculum	1	2	3	4
j. LEP reading curriculum (BROOKE only)	1	2	3	4
k. Quality of staff	1	2	3	4
l. Local budget	1	2	3	4

COMMENTS:

INDICATE YOUR AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER:

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DON'T KNOW
2. Summer school works best when scheduled at the beginning of the summer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Students' 1981-82 schools were cooperative when asked for additional information about students or teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Resource teachers or aides should be available on each summer school campus.						
COMMUNITY SCHOOL:						
5. Community school activities were well planned and organized.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Children appeared to enjoy the community school activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. It is important to have the community school libraries open and available for summer school students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Overall, the community school activities enhanced the summer school program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Community school activities should be included in the summer school program next year.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. It was easy to coordinate the schedules of the instructional program and community school programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. What effect, if any, did community school activities have on the regular summer school learning process?						

12. Do you have any suggestions for ways to improve the community school component of future summer schools?

ENROLLMENT:

13. When do you think summer school enrollment should be closed?
    _____ Before the first day How long before? _____
    _____ On the first day
    _____ At the end of the first week
    _____ Other (Specify)_____

14. Did the student data cards provide enough information? _____ Yes _____ No
    What should be added?

    Did the lack of information on some students seem to have any harmful effects?

15. How many students attended summer school at your campus who were not retainees?_____
    If any, please provide their names and identification numbers so we can count them separately.

TRAINING:

16. How would you rate your training in the following areas (circle one or more):

	WONDERFUL	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	UNNECESSARY	DID NOT RECEIVE
a. reading curriculum	1	2	3	4	5
b. math curriculum	1	2	3	4	5
c. home visits/phone calls	1	2	3	4	5
d. schedule for school day	1	2	3	4	5
e. record-keeping requirements	1	2	3	4	5
f. assigning students to classes	1	2	3	4	5

17. What areas did you need more information about? Do you have any ideas about how this could be handled better next year?

18. What did you like best about this summer school?

19. What changes are most needed next year?

THANK YOU!

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO JOHN MAC DONALD, ADM. BLDG., BOX 79

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

SUMMER SCHOOL DIRECTOR SURVEY

As directors, you have the best view of how the summer school worked on your campus. We need your help in identifying strength and weaknesses in this year's summer school program. Please respond to the questions listed below. Feel free to add comments on the survey or call Nancy Baenen or John MacDonald with them at 458-1229. Individual responses are confidential. Results will be reported for directors as a group. Results should be summarized in September and will be circulated to all appropriate parties.

1. GENERAL REACTION TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM:
(Circle appropriate number)

$\bar{X}$		WONDERFUL	ADEQUATE		INADEQUATE	DON'T KNOW	Blank
1.20	a. Organization in your school	1 IIII (80%)	2 I (20%)	3		4	
1.60	b. Effectiveness in improving student's skills	1 II (40%)	2 III (60%)	3		4	
1.80	c. Teacher schedule and planning time	1 II (40%)	2 II (40%)	3	I (20%)	4	
1.40	d. Pupil-teacher ratio	1 III (60%)	2 II (40%)	3		4	
1.86	e. Rewards (calculators)	→ I (20%)	2 I (20%)	3		4	
1.25	f. Rewards (Scented stickers)	* 1 III (75%)	2 I (25%)	3		4	
1.33	g. Other rewards (specify any you especially liked)	* 1 II (66.7%)	2 I (33.3%)	3		4	
1.20	h. Math curriculum	1 IIII (80%)	2 I (20%)	3		4	
1.20	i. Reading curriculum	1 IIII (80%)	2 I (20%)	3		4	
2.00	j. LEP reading curriculum (BROOKE only)	* 1	2 I (100%)	3		4	I
1.00	k. Quality of staff	I (20%)	2	3		4	
1.40	l. Local budget	1 III (60%)	2 II (40%)	3		4	

COMMENTS:

* : PERCENT IS PERCENT OF ALL SCORABLE RESPONSES
→ : THIS ITEM DOUBLE-SCORED BY ONE RESPONDENT

INDICATE YOUR AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER:

$\bar{X}$		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DON'T KNOW
1.20	2. Summer school works best when scheduled at the beginning of the summer.	1 IIII (80%)	2 I (20%)	3	4	5	6
2.40	3. Students' 1981-82 schools were cooperative when asked for additional information about students or teachers.	1	2 III (60%)	3	4 I (20%)	5	6
1.33	4. Resource teachers or aides should be available on each summer school campus.	* 1 II (66.7%)	2 I (33.3%)				
	COMMUNITY SCHOOL:						
2.00	5. Community school activities were well planned and organized.	1 I (20%)	2 III (60%)	3 I (20%)	4	5	6
→ 1.80	6. Children appeared to enjoy the community school activities.	1 I (20%)	2 IIII (80%)	3	4	5	6
2.20	7. It is important to have the community school libraries open and available for summer school students.	1 I (20%)	2 II (40%)	3	4 I (20%)	5	6
2.40	8. Overall, the community school activities enhanced the summer school program.	1 I (20%)	2 II (40%)	3 I (20%)	4 I (20%)	5	6
2.40	9. Community school activities should be included in the summer school program next year.	1 II (40%)	2 I (20%)	3 I (20%)	4	5 I (20%)	6
2.20	10. It was easy to coordinate the schedules of the instructional program and community school programs.	1 II (40%)	2 II (40%)	3	4	5 I (20%)	6
	11. What effect, if any, did community school activities have on the regular summer school learning process?						

* : PERCENT IS PERCENT OF ALL SCORABLE RESPONSES

12. Do you have any suggestions for ways to improve the community school component of future summer schools?

ENROLLMENT:

13. When do you think summer school enrollment should be closed?

(10%) IIII Before the first day How long before? ____ AT LEAST A WEEK IIII
____ On the first day Before Reg. School ends I
____ At the end of the first week
I Other (Specify)_____

14. Did the student data cards provide enough information? I (20%) Yes IIII (80%) No
What should be added?

Did the lack of information on some students seem to have any harmful effects?

15. How many students attended summer school at your campus who were not retainees? 9 IIII I (30%)
If any, please provide their names and identification numbers so we can count them separately.

TRAINING:

16. How would you rate your training in the following areas (circle one or more):

$\bar{X}$		WONDERFUL	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	UNNECESSARY	DID NOT RECEIVE
1.80	a. reading curriculum	1 I (20%)	2 IIII (80%)	3	4	5
1.80	b. math curriculum	1 I	2 IIII (80%)	3	4	5
2.00	c. home visits/phone calls	1	2 IIII (100%)	3	4	5
2.00	d. schedule for school day	1 I (20%)	2	3 I (20%)	4 I (20%)	5
2.25	e. record-keeping requirements	1 I (25%)	2 III (75%)	3 II (50%)	4	5
2.00	f. assigning students to classes	1	2 IIII (100%)	3	4	5

17. What areas did you need more information about? Do you have any ideas about how this could be handled better next year?

18. What did you like best about this summer school?

19. What changes are most needed next year?

THANK YOU!

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO JOHN MAC DONALD, ADM. BLDG., BOX 79

1. GENERAL REACTION TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM

g. Other rewards (specify any you especially liked):

- Paper certificates! (rated "1" = "Wonderful")
- Weekly attendance awards; coin purses (rated "2" = "Adequate")
- Certificates (rated "1")

COMMENTS (on general reaction to summer school):

- Teachers should have had at least one hour planning period at the end of the day. By the time buses were loaded and students were out of the building, it was 12:40-12:45 and teachers had only 15-20 minutes of paid planning time.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL:

4. Resource teachers or aides should be available on each summer school campus. (A "STRONGLY AGREE" to "STRONGLY DISAGREE" scaled item)

- Disagree; perhaps a counselor.

11. What effect, if any, did the community school activities have on the regular summer school learning process?

- The community school activities provided that necessary "break" or recess time for students to relax and exercise and "do something different" from reading or math. I strongly believe the success at our campus was due to the excellent planning and cooperation of the community school staff.
- The community school activities supplemented summer school very well! The major problems I had with community school were the supervision of children for the afternoon school classes and building maintenance.
- Provided a break and different type of activities.
- No noticeable effect!

Spontaneous comments on the Community School:

- Super job!

12. Do you have any suggestions for ways to improve the community school component of future summer schools?

- It really does not work well when people who are not teachers handle groups of kids.
- Continue to provide a wide variety of courses or activities for the students and not allow a large period of time for recess or outdoor play (30 minutes is sufficient; possibly less).
- The District should give more financial support to community school if the program is used next year.
- Employ trained workers for the various activities. Provide a trained counselor for students.
- Supervision was somewhat of a problem. More discipline problems arose during the community school component than at other times of the day.

14. Did the student data cards provide enough information? What should be added?

- Teacher's name, address.
- Teacher's name should have been on the card.
- Need school and teacher on entry form. Need cumulative folder.

Did the lack of information on some students seem to have any harmful effects?

- No.
- Yes, when the teacher was out of town.
- Somewhat--it would have been helpful to have complete information on current ITBS scores and students' birthdate, ethnicity, etc. on the card.
- No, since the curriculum was so structured and the direct-teach model was used this had little effect.
- No.

15. How many students attended summer school at your campus who were not retainees? If any, please provide their names and identification numbers so we can count them separately.

    - None to my knowledge. However, we had no way of checking retainees from previous years.

17. What areas did you need more information about? Do you have any ideas about how this could be handled better next year?

    - Problem--handling of student cards and registration forms by the central office, transportation, and the summer school. A better way should be found to minimize paperwork getting lost and still have the student attend the school closest to home.

    - Grouping of students for reading and the assigned levels. Could be handled by planning earlier.

    - Record-keeping requirements were constantly changing or someone adding something the last week of school. All requirements need to be finalized and explained to teachers and directors before summer school begins.

    - My problem was one of time--being assigned late.

18. What did you like best about this summer school?

    - I liked the curriculum and rewards--but we need to refine the rewards.

    - Opportunity for students to work with calculators in class and be able to take them home on their own. Small classes were great!

    - The curriculum materials. Students focused on schedule.

    - The lack of pressure on students and teachers; the dedication and sincere interest of our staff in promoting and working for the success of our students; the rewards and positive attention our students received (the discipline problems were very minimal); and the length of the school day was perfect.

    - The curriculum and the teachers selected were very good!

19. What changes are most needed next year?

- Have teachers work on the committee on curriculum so that we could avoid minor slipups; i.e., they know what materials, supplies would be needed and practical aspects of the program. We had a great experience at Becker.

- Too many questions are left unanswered by leaving registration open until school begins. Materials need to be ordered, classroom furniture arranged, snacks ordered, etc. I suggest closing registration about a week before school starts. Overall, however, the summer school was good for the kids, and AISD should continue summer school next summer.

- Start planning earlier and have a cutoff date for enrollment.

  1) As much advanced planning as possible involving everyone concerned.

  2) Ordering rewards, stickers, etc. earlier with the involvement of the staff at each local campus (even consider giving each teacher $25 - $50 to use in purchasing rewards for their own class).

  3) Letting everyone know what the official last working day will be before they contract to teach--this year's changes and "surprises" were unnecessary and unprofessional, in my opinion.

  4) Having enough supplies on hand in the warehouse for summer schools—this would only require early planning and looking at what was used this year so that those items could be on hand the first of June or earlier!

  Thanks for giving me the opportunity. I only hope it will help for next year.

- The logistics for organizing summer school need to be coordinated better. The enrollment should be CLOSED at LEAST a week before summer school begins so that materials, schedules, etc. can be finalized.

Summer School Pilot Project

Appendix I

TEACHER SURVEY

82.25 Instrument Description: Teacher Survey

Brief description of the instrument:

The Teacher Survey was designed to assess teachers' perceptions of the quality of the summer school program, their perceptions of the quality of the in-service preparation they received, their perceptions of the effectiveness of the home visits and of the phone calls made to their students' former teachers, and their perceptions of the effectiveness of the summer school curriculum. Three forms were used: one for math teachers, one for reading teachers, and the third for LEP reading and LEP math teachers. These three forms are contained in Attachment I-1.

To whom was the instrument administered?

All 77 of the summer school teachers were sent the teacher survey.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

When was the instrument administered?

The survey was delivered by ORE personnel to teacher mailboxes on July 6, 1982, during the last week of the summer school.

Where was the instrument administered?

Teachers completed the survey at their schools or other location of choice.

Who administered the instrument?

The instrument was self-administered.

What training did the administrators have?

N/A

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

Several teachers double-responded to some items. During keypunching, these items were coded on an alternating low-high scheme; e.g., if two teachers circled both 2 and 3 when responding to an item, the first teacher's response was coded as a 2, and the other teacher's response was coded as a 3. Of the 77 teachers, 73 returned surveys, for a return rate of 95%.

Who developed the instrument?

Office of Research and Evaluation staff.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

24

TEACHER SURVEY

Purpose

The Summer School Teacher Survey was administered to gather information regarding the following decision and evaluation questions:

Decision Question D2: Was the structure of summer school appropriate for future summer schools? Are alterations necessary?

Evaluation Question D2-1: What training did staff receive? Did staff feel the training was effective?

Evaluation Question D2-12: What effect did the home visit have on parents' activities with their children?

Decision Question D3: Should additional information be provided to teachers about the students before the start of future summer school programs?

Evaluation Question D3-2: Were summer school teachers able to reach regular school teachers of assigned retainees?

Evaluation Question D3-3: Were teachers able to visit the homes of assigned retainees?

Evaluation Question D3-4: How valuable were the home visits perceived to be by the summer school teachers?

Decision Question D4: Should retainees be encouraged to attend summer school?

Evaluation Question D4-5: Can any variables be identified that relate to student achievement?

Procedure

The Summer School Teacher Survey was designed by Office of Research and Evaluation staff during June 1982. Three forms of the survey were constructed: Form R for reading teachers, Form M for math teachers, and Form L for teachers of Limited English Proficiency students. These three forms are contained in Attachment I-1. The first 14 items are common to all three forms; these items

concern general reactions to the summer school program, the quality of the inservice preparation, the home visits and phone calls made to students' former teachers, the enrollment policy, and the community school activities. Items which were not common to all three forms concerned the curricular materials used in the summer school. Form M and Form L each had eight items concerning the curriculum, and Form R had five items.

Summer school directors were surveyed concerning the topics which were discussed at the local inservice sessions. A draft copy of the survey was sent to the directors for their comments and suggestions. The finalized surveys were distributed to teachers during the last week of summer school. A total of 73 of the 77 teachers returned surveys to ORE for a return rate of 95%.

Teachers' responses to scaled items were summarized by obtaining frequencies of responses to each. These frequencies are reported separately for reading, math, and LEP teachers in Attachment I-1. Overall responses for common questions by all groups of teachers combined are shown in Attachment I-2. Teachers' comments are reported in Attachment I-3.

Results

Results are reported here as they pertain to each evaluation question.

Evaluation Question D2-1: What training did staff receive? Did staff feel the training was effective?

Teaching staff received inservice training on several dates. On May 15, an inservice session providing a general overview of the program and the curriculum was presented for all teachers at the central administration building. After May 15, the summer school enrollment increased beyond initial estimates, and new summer school teachers were hired. The general overview was again presented on May 31 for these teachers. On June 1 and June 2, inservice sessions concerning the summer school program at the local campus level were presented on each summer school campus.

An item concerning which inservice sessions teachers attended was added after the survey had been sent to three schools, and so only 29 teachers were asked which inservice workshops they had attended. Of these, three (10.3%) were hired so late that they could not attend any workshops. The central inservice sessions were attended by 16 (55.2%) of the teachers, and 24 (82.8%) attended the local inservice sessions. The local inservice sessions thus reached the highest number of teachers.

The topics mentioned by summer school directors as covered in the local inservice were addressed in question 4 on the survey. Teachers were asked to rate these topics on a scale from "1" ("essential") to "5" ("useless"). The mean ratings that math, reading, and LEP teachers each gave are contained in Figure I-1. More than half of all teachers rated every topic as essential

READING (N=32)		MATH (N=33)		LEP (N=3)	
				Reward Programs	(1.00)
				Conducting Home Visits/ Phone Calls	(1.00)
				Attendance Procedures	(1.33)
Reward Programs	(1.4)				
School Schedule	(1.5)				
Program Organiz.	(1.6)	School Sched.	(1.6)		
Use of Curr. Matls.	(1.7)			School Schedule	(1.7)
Attendance Proced.	(1.7)			Using School Equip.	(1.7)
Discipline	(1.7)				
Self-Concept	(1.7)	Attendance	(1.8)		
Community School	(1.9)	Building Self-Concept	(1.9)		
		Reward Programs	(2.0)	Discipline	(2.0)
		Program Org.	(2.0)	Community School	(2.0)
		Use of Curr. Mat.	(2.1)	Grouping Students	(2.0)
School Equipment	(2.2)	Discipline	(2.2)		
Grouping Students	(2.3)			Program Org.	(2.3)
Conducting Home Vis.	(2.3)			Use of Curr. Mat.	(2.33)
		Community School	(2.4)		
Accounting	(2.5)	Grouping Students	(2.5)	Accounting	(2.5)
		Accounting	(2.5)		
		Using School Equipment	(2.6)		
		Conducting Home Visits/P.C.s	(2.6)		

Figure I-1. RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE GIVEN BY TEACHERS TO IN-SERVICE TOPICS. A rating of 1.0 means teachers considered that topic to be "essential", 2.0 means "very helpful", 3.0 means "fairly helpful", and 4.0 means "useless"

or very helpful. Reading, math, and LEP teachers tended to rate inservice training in the use of the reward systems, discussion of the school schedule, and program organization as most essential in preparing them to teach summer school. Reading teachers rated discussion of disciplinary procedures as more essential than d[illegible] math or LEP teachers. LEP teachers were unanimous in the belief that inservice activities preparing teachers to conduct home visits were essential; however, the reading and math teachers found this to be only "fairly helpful."

Most of the summer school teachers attended the local inservice sessions. Of all of the topics reported by the directors as having been covered, the most essential in the view of most teachers was the topic of how the reward systems were to be carried out. It is interesting that only the three LEP teachers considered the inservice on conducting home visits to be essential. It may be that LEP teachers consider home visits to be essential to the success of their instructional efforts, or that LEP teachers feel a greater challenge in making a successful home visit than do non-LEP teachers. Non-LEP teachers expressed some frustration with the amount of time spent conducting home visits, but generally found them useful.

Ten teachers provided comments about the inservice activities. Three of these said that the May 15 inservice should have provided more information about teaching summer-school students. Two commented that the inservice activities were very helpful and should be repeated. Others commented that the inservice was well-planned, that it was necessary in achieving success, and that the director was very sensitive to teacher concerns. More negative comments were that the discussion of self-concept was "a waste of time," that the inservice should be conducted earlier so that teachers can get their materials ready earlier, and that extra planning time for teachers was needed for activities conducted during the inservice.

Evaluation Question D3-2: Were summer school teachers able to reach regular school teachers of assigned retainees?

Evaluation Question D3-3: Were teachers able to visit the homes of assigned retainees?

As reported in Appendix B of the first report, teachers were able to complete 383 of the 592 assigned teacher calls (64.7%) and 140 of the 144 assigned home visits (97.9%). Part of this difference in completion rates is due to the way the process was set up; more phone calls were assigned, teachers were told they did not have to substitute other teachers if they made at least two attempts to reach those assigned, and two alternates were chosen for the home visits.

Evaluation Question D3-4: How valuable were the home visits perceived to be by summer school teachers?

A related question not specifically stated in the evaluation design is how valuable the telephone calls to former teachers were perceived to be. To gather information on the relative value of each, summer school teachers were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with the statement that:

"Calling former teachers was more useful than making home visits."

Of the 69 teachers responding, 32% agreed that calling teachers was more useful and 28% disagreed (indicating they thought both were equally useful or home visits were more useful). A large percentage (41%) were neutral on the question. Thus, the responses to this question did not indicate a clear preference for home visits or calls to former teachers.

Teachers were also asked whether the home visits and calls to former teachers provided information useful in teaching the children. Overall, 88% said home visits provided useful information at least to some extent. Specifically, 34% felt visits provided useful information to a great extent, 54% felt the information was useful to some extent, and 11% said the home visits provided no useful information. The three LEP teachers seemed to view the information as more valuable than other teachers—two of the three (67%) said the information was valuable to a great extent.

In terms of telephone calls to former teachers, 47% agreed that the information supplied was useful, 39% were neutral, and 14% disagreed. This suggests a slightly more positive view towards the home visit information.

Open-ended comments were also solicited on the survey about home visits and phone calls to former teachers. In general, comments were less frequent and more positive about home visits as compared to phone calls to teachers.

Thirteen positive and five negative specific comments were made by teachers on the survey about home visits (see Attachment I-3). Positive comments generally centered on the idea that the visits were enjoyable, that they increased teachers' understanding of the child's academic problems and home environment, and that the parents seemed to like them. Negative comments were that home visits did not provide useful information (three teachers), were dangerous (one teacher), were time-consuming (two teachers), and were difficult to schedule (one teacher).

In contrast to home visit comments, more teachers specifically said negative things about phone calls than positive. About 34 negative comments and eight positive comments were noted. Many teachers felt the telephone calls to former teachers simply did not provide information that was not available through other sources. Seven specifically mentioned that most of the same information was or could be available through the student enrollment information card or strengths and weaknesses sheets. At least five teachers said

former teachers were not very cooperative, largely because they felt they had put the information on the strengths and weaknesses sheets or because principals had not notified them they might be called. Ten teachers said former teachers were difficult to reach. Four said former teachers were too negative about the students and that the children were actually better than they had been led to believe they would be.

Although some comments referred to problems with the process that were specific to this year and that could be corrected, the general sentiment seemed to be that phone calls to former teachers did not provide information that was not available on forms already being completed on retainees. Teachers seemed to feel that the strengths and weaknesses sheets filled out on each retainee in the spring should be forwarded to the summer school teacher and that these sheets could supply most of the same information gained by the calls. The regular school year teachers' name and telephone number should also be listed on the enrollment card so the summer school teacher could easily call if this was felt to be necessary. Regular school-year teachers should be informed that they might be called.

Evaluation Question D2-12: What effect did the home visit have on parents' activities with their children?

Some light may be shed on whether home visits are likely to have some positive general effects by asking teachers if they observed any events that might be related to the home visit or by asking parents if they did anything different with their children as a result of the visit. Simply asking teachers if they believed home visits were effective is likely to result in positively biased responses. Asking teachers to be specific about changes will minimize this biasing effect, however. Another problem that must be considered is that teachers made the home visit before they knew the child, and so had no "control child" with which to compare the child after receiving the home visit.

Teachers were asked to provide specific events which led them to believe that the home visits were effective. Forty-five teachers provided responses to this item. Thirteen (29%) said there were no observable changes in home-school relations. Nine (20%) said the child appeared to be more comfortable with the teacher than children not receiving home visits; one teacher said that a reluctant sibling decided to attend summer school after she visited the children's parents. Six teachers (13%) reported better attendance among children receiving home visits than among children whose parents were not visited. Four (9%) reported that parents demonstrated greater interest after a home visit by making school visits themselves and exchanging notes with the teacher.

One final item related to the home visits asked about the extent to which the home visit improved the relationship between the home and school. Overall, 32% (22) of the 69 teachers responding believed it improved the relationship to a great extent, with 57% (39) saying to some extent, and 12% (8) saying not at all. Thus, 89% felt the home visits improved the home-school relationship at least to some extent.

Apparently, home visits generally do improve the relationship between teachers and parents at least to some extent. These effects seem related to attendance, and to interest in school on the part of both the child and the parents. However, we do not have enough information about what teacher behaviors during home visits make them effective. We know less about the information gained from the home visit.

Enrollment.

Teachers were also asked about enrollment issues. A majority (90%) of teachers had students who were registered but who did not show up. Both math and reading teachers had a median of three students not showing up. LEP teachers had a median of six students not showing up. Reading teachers reported a median of 3½ students enrolling on the first day or thereafter, math teachers reported two students adding, and LEP teachers reported a median of three students added. Reading and math teachers should have reported the same number of students being added on or after the first day, but this was not the case. Some reading teachers reported as many as twelve students being added on or after the first day, whereas no math teachers reported any more than five students being added the first day or after. Teachers were asked if the late additions were detrimental to their teaching effectiveness. Almost all (72) teachers responded to this item. Of the math teachers, 17 (53.1%) responded that it was detrimental, but only nine reading teachers (28.1%) considered the additions detrimental. Two of the three LEP teachers believed their teaching was detrimentally affected by the late additions.

Teachers were asked how the late additions were detrimental to teaching effectiveness. Thirty teachers provided responses. The most frequently reported problem concerned how far behind the children arriving late were, and how difficult it was to find time to help them catch up (13 responses, 43.3%). Another problem was finding supplies and materials for the late arrivals (five, or 16.7%). Other problems mentioned getting new children adjusted to the routine (13.4%), the lack of information available on new children (13.3%), excessive distractions, difficulty in pacing instruction, the poor attendance of late arrivals, the problem of regrouping students, and changing seating arrangements (each of these were given by one teacher each). One teacher reported that following the enrollment of late arrivals, she had three grade levels in her classroom and had difficulty maintaining discipline.

There are several decisions that might be made regarding problems with late-arriving students. One is to close enrollment early, so that there are few late arrivals. This is probably the most efficient solution. Other solutions will be more costly. For those students who do arrive late, the main problems that would have to be alleviated would be getting supplies and materials for them, getting information about them and helping them catch up to their summer classmates.

The supply problem would have to be alleviated by making sure teachers have an adequate supply based on the knowledge of how many late arrivals there are likely to be. Ninety percent of math teachers had less than five late additions after school started (less than 30% of class enrollment). Ninety percent of reading teachers had less than seven (less than 50% of class enrollment). Because of the cost of materials, it will be difficult to oversupply teachers. What latecomers have missed in instruction might be made up by peer tutoring; however, this may take basic instruction time away from the student who is the tutor, unless the tutoring is done during the Community School time. Getting information quickly about these students will also be difficult because, by definition, nobody knows who these students are until they arrive in class, and obtaining information and transferring it to the summer school teacher needs advance planning. The most productive solution may be to close enrollment sometime before the first day of summer school.

Curriculum:

Teachers were also asked about the quality of the curricular materials. These results will be discussed by subject area.

Reading Teachers: Thirty-three reading teachers provided responses to these items. More than 80% of the teachers judged the quality, appropriateness, and usefulness of the reading materials to be excellent or good. Nine percent of the teachers considered the quality and appropriateness to be poor. Only two teachers who rated the quality of materials as inadequate or poor gave reasons for this rating; one said the materials were too easy for students, the other said the materials were too difficult. As for student response to reading materials, all teachers reported that students liked the materials. Two-thirds of the teachers reported that students liked Scholastic Text Extenders "a great deal," about half of the teachers reported that students liked the CMLR System materials "a great deal," and 60% of the teachers reported that students liked Modern Curriculum Press Primary Books "a great deal."

A large majority of teachers felt that CMLR and Scholastic Text Extenders should be used again (88% and 97%, respectively). Sixty-two per cent felt that Modern Curriculum Press books should be used again, and only 41% felt Houghton-Mifflin Mini-Books should be used again.

Another question concerned what activities teachers were engaged in other than teaching CMLR for at least 10 minutes a day. Most of the teachers (76%) had daily reading aloud and independent reading (73%); 44% of teachers engaged in vocabulary instruction, 32% in phonics instruction, 21% in mixed skill workbooks, and 3% in performing plays. Other activities included storywriting, book reports, journal writing, and study skills.

Teachers were asked if they had an adequate supply of all materials and 25 teachers responded. Of these teachers, 22 (88%) had an adequate supply. Three teachers (12%) responded that they would have liked workbooks for comprehension exercises. Another teacher thought that workbooks on word-attack skills for intermediate students would have been helpful.

Math Teachers: Of the 36 math teachers responding, 66% and 69% of the teachers described the curriculum's quality and appropriateness as "excellent" or "good", respectively. About 11% and 8% viewed the materials as "inadequate" or "poor". The primary problem areas suggested for improvement were:

- Finding a workbook that correlates better with Math for Everyone than Succeeding in Mathematics (15 teachers);
- Coordinating the workbook and objectives better (5 teachers);
- Providing more manipulatives, hands-on materials, and math games (11 teachers);
- Improving the tests--some were confusing, some didn't test the skills well, some skills had no tests, some activity sheets had incorrect responses (10 teachers);
- Providing more sufficient supplies of thermofax and ditto paper (6 teachers);
- Providing more skill practice sheets (5 teachers);
- Reducing paperwork (2 teachers).

The grade 2 teachers seemed most concerned about the coordination of materials and the tests.

A large number of teachers reported that students liked calculator enrichment "a great deal" (86%). A third of the teachers reported that their students liked Math for Everyone "a great deal," and 29% reported their students liked Succeeding in Math "a great deal." As to which materials should be used again, 89% of the teachers said calculator enrichment, 76% said Math for Everyone, and 54% said Succeeding in Mathematics. When asked which materials should be eliminated next year, six of 16 (38%) said none, nine (56%) said Succeeding in Mathematics should be eliminated, and four (25%) said Math for Everyone.

Most math teachers said they received an adequate supply of materials (81%). Of the other 19%, five teachers reported that they needed more ditto paper, transparencies, and thermofax masters. One teacher said that she didn't have enough scented stickers to give out ten a day and that the stickers were not scented. Another teacher said textbooks were needed. Full comments made by math teachers about the program in general and its strengths and weaknesses are contained in Attachment I-3.

LEP Teachers: Only three LEP teachers were involved in the program. One teacher taught both reading and math, another teacher taught only math, and the third teacher taught only Spanish reading and English as a Second Language. For purposes of rating LEP curricula, there were two teachers rating the math and two teachers rating the Spanish reading/ESL materials.

One reading/ESL teacher rated both the quality and appropriateness of the curricula as "excellent," and the usefulness of the materials as "adequate." The other teacher rated the quality, appropriateness and usefulness of the curricula as "adequate." Both teachers reported that students liked the materials "a great deal," and both teachers thought the materials should be used again.

One math teacher rated the quality of the math materials as "good," the appropriateness of the materials as "adequate," and the usefulness as "adequate." The other teacher rated the quality of the materials as "inadequate," the appropriateness of the materials as "inadequate," and the usefulness as "adequate." Both teachers said the students liked calculator enrichment "a great deal," one teacher reported that students liked Math for Everyone and Succeeding in Mathematics "a great deal," and the other said students considered these two books "okay." Both teachers thought the materials should be used again. All teachers reported they had enough materials except one teacher who reported she needed more Spanish workbooks.

Impressions:

Problems associated with this year's summer school might be alleviated in future summer schools by closing enrollment early. Teachers could then know which students will be in their classes, how many materials they will need, and will not have to divide their efforts by taking time to help latecomers get oriented and get caught up.

Home visits and contact with the former teacher both appear to be of benefit to both teachers and students. They do require extra pay to teachers, however, so alternatives might be considered. Skills strengths and weaknesses sheets from previous teachers might provide at least some of the information provided through phone calls. Some mechanism for getting this information to the summer school teacher needs to be developed and implemented.

82.25

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION - JUNE 1982

SUMMER SCHOOL TEACHER SURVEY

LEP N=3

All summer school teachers are being asked to complete this survey. Information from this staff survey will help in planning future summer schools by identifying problems which might be improved upon and strengths which should be built upon in future summer schools. Your responses will be kept confidential. Please respond to the specific questions listed below. Feel free to add comments to any questions.

GENERAL REACTION TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM: (Circle one)

1. In general, how would you rate the summer school's:

$\bar{X}$		WONDERFUL #	%	ADEQUATE #	%	INADEQUATE #	%	NOT APPLICABLE #	%
1.67	a. Organization in your school	1	33	2	67	3	0	4	0
1.00	b. Effectiveness in improving students' skills	1	100	2	0	3	0	4	0
1.67	c. Teacher schedule and planning time	1	33	2	67	3	0	4	0
1.00	d. Pupil-teacher ratio	1	100	2	0	3	0	4	0
1.00	e. Rewards (calculators)	1	100	2	0	3	0	4	0
1.00	f. Rewards (scented stickers)	1	100	2	0	3	0	4	0
1.00	g. Other rewards (specify any you especially liked): _____	1	100	2	0	3	0	4	0

2. What did you like best about summer school this year?

% = PERCENT OF ALL SCORABLE RESPONSES

3. What changes are most needed next year?

IN-SERVICE PREPARATION:

4. The following topics were discussed at local in-service workshops. Not every school covered the same topics. Please rate the following topics according to their effectiveness in helping you teach your summer school class.

$\bar{X}$		ESSENTIAL	VERY HELPFUL	FAIRLY HELPFUL	USELESS	NOT COVERED
2.33	a. Organization of the program	1 33	2 0	3 67	4 0	5 0
2.00	b. Grouping of students for reading/math	1 33	2 33	3 33	4 0	5 0
2.33	c. Use of the curricular materials in your subject area (reading/math)	1 33	2 0	3 67	4 0	5 0
2.00	d. Community School program	1 0	2 100	3 0	4 0	5 0
1.67	e. Your school's daily schedule	1 33	2 67	3 0	4 0	5 0
1.33	f. Building self-concept	1 67	2 33	3 0	4 0	5 0
2.00	g. Discipline procedures	1 33	2 33	3 33	4 0	5 0
1.00	h. Reward programs	1 100	2 0	3 0	4 0	5 0
1.00	i. Conducting home visits/phone calls	1 100	2 0	3 0	4 0	5 0
1.67	j. Using school equipment and other resources	1 33	2 67	3 0	4 0	5 0
1.33	k. Attendance policies	1 67	2 33	3 0	4 0	5 0
2.50	l. Accounting procedures for equipment/supplies	1 0	2 50	3 50	4 0	5 0

Did you attend these inservice sessions? Overview on May 15 1 (33) Overview on May 11 _____

Campus Inservice on June 1 11 (67) June 2 11 (67)

Comments: N=3 none 1 (33)

HOME VISITS AND PHONE CALLS TO FORMER TEACHERS:

		TO A GREAT EXTENT	TO SOME EXTENT	NOT AT ALL
1.33	5. The home visit provided information which was useful in teaching the children.	1 11 (67)	2 1 (33)	3 (0)
1.33	6. The home visit improved the relationship between home and school.	1 11 (67)	2 1 (33)	3 (0)

7. Did anything specific happen which demonstrated this improved relationship?

		AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE
1.00	8. The information received from the former teacher was useful in teaching the children.	1 111 (100)	2 (0)	3 (0)
1.67	9. Calling former teachers was more useful than making home visits.	1 1 (33)	2 11 (67)	3 (0)

COMMENTS about home visits and phone calls:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENROLLMENT:

10. How many students originally scheduled to be in your first period class did not show up at all? 4 (1) 12 (1) 7 (1) $\bar{x} = 7.67$; med = 7.0; mode = 2.25 — 5 (1) 2 (1) 6 (1) $\bar{x} = 1.0$; med = 1.0 — $\bar{x} = 3.67$ med = 2.25
11. How many students were added the first day? 3 (1) After the first day? 7 (1)
12. Did the late additions affect your teaching effectiveness?
    Yes, a lot ____ Yes, a little 11 (67%) Unsure 1 (33%)
13. If the late additions were detrimental, how?

14. When do you think summer school enrollment should be closed?
    ____ Before the first day
    11 (67%) On the first day
    1 (33%) At the end of the first week
    ____ Other (Specify) _____

LEP TEACHERS: MATERIALS

15. What subject(s) did you teach? 11 (50%) Math 11 (50%) Reading

Respond to all questions that apply to you:

$\bar{x}$			EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	POOR
2.00	16. How would you rate the quality of the curricular materials?	Reading:	1 (50)	2	3 (50)	4	5
3.00		Math :	1	2 (50)	3	4 (50)	5
2.00	17. How would you rate the appropriateness of the materials for you students' functional level?	Reading:	1 (50)	2	3 (50)	4	5
3.50		Math :	1	2	3 (50)	4 (50)	5
3.00	18. How would you rate the usefulness of the materials for summer school?	Reading:	1	2	3 (100)	4	5
3.00		Math :	1	2	3 (100)	4	5

		A GREAT DEAL	OKAY	DID NOT LIKE	NOT APPLICABLE
	19. How did the students like:				
1.00	a. Stepping Into English	1 (100)	2	3	4
1.00	b. Play and Practice	1 (100)	2	3	4
1.00	c. "I Like English" picture cards	1 (100)	2	3	4
1.50	d. Supplemental Readers ("Caracolitos," "Una Cosa")	1 (50)	2 (50)	3	4
	20. How did the students like:				
1.50	a. Math for Everyone	1 (50)	2 (50)	3	4
1.50	b. Succeeding in Mathematics	1 (50)	2 (50)	3	4
1.00	c. Calculator Enrichment	1 (100)	2	3	4

21. What reading materials should be used again? (Check any or all)
    11 (100) Stepping into English
    11 (100) Play and Practice
    11 (100) "I Like English" picture cards
    11 (100) Supplemental Readers
    1 (9) Other (specify) _____
22. What math materials should be used again?
    11 (100) Math for Everyone
    11 (100) Succeeding in Mathematics
    11 (100) Calculator Enrichment
23. Did you receive an adequate supply of all materials? 11 (92) Yes 1 (8) No
    If not, what did you lack?

24. What do you see as the strengths of the materials used? _____
    _____
    Weaknesses? _____
    _____

25. Were there any materials you did not have that you feel would be helpful for future summer schools?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL:

THANK YOU!
PLEASE RETURN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO: JOHN MAC DONALD, ORE, ADM. BLDG., BOX 79

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION - JUNE 1982

SUMMER SCHOOL TEACHER SURVEY — Reading N = 34

All summer school teachers are being asked to complete this survey. Information from this staff survey will help in planning future summer schools by identifying problems which might be improved upon and strengths which should be built upon in future summer schools. Your responses will be kept confidential. Please respond to the specific questions listed below. Feel free to add comments to any questions.

GENERAL REACTION TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM: (Circle one)

1. In general, how would you rate the summer school's:

X̄				WONDERFUL	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	NOT APPLICABLE
1.21	a.	Organization in your school	n=34	1 72.4%	2 [illegible]%	3 2.9%	4 0.0%
1.71	b.	Effectiveness in improving students' skills	n=31	1 35.5	2 58.1	3 6.5	4 0.0
1.77	c.	Teacher schedule and planning time	n=34	1 76.5	2 20.6	3 2.9	4 0.0
1.38	d.	Pupil-teacher ratio	n=34	1 70.6	2 20.6	3 7.8	4 0.0
1.12	e.	Rewards (calculators)	n=34	1 [illegible]	2 [illegible]	3 0.0	4 2.9
1.18	f.	Rewards (scented stickers)	n=34	1 82.4	2 17.6	3 0.0	4 0.0
1.12	g.	Other rewards (specify any you especially liked): _____	n=20	1 [illegible]	2 [illegible]	3 0.0	4 5.0

2. What did you like best about summer school this year?

3. What changes are most needed next year?

IN-SERVICE PREPARATION:

4. The following topics were discussed at local in-service workshops. Not every school covered the same topics. Please rate the following topics according to their effectiveness in helping you teach your summer school class.

X̄				VERY ESSENTIAL	FAIRLY HELPFUL	FAIRLY HELPFUL	USELESS	NOT COVERED
1.56	a.	Organization of the program	n=32	1 53.1%	2 37.5%	3 9.4%	4 0.0%	5 0.0%
1.99	b.	Grouping of students for reading/math	n=31	1 32.1	2 39.3	3 25.0	4 3.5	5 7.7
1.72	c.	Use of the curricular materials in your subject area (reading/math)	n=32	1 53.1	2 28.1	3 12.5	4 6.3	5 0.0
1.73	d.	Community School program	n=31	1 51.7	2 24.1	3 24.1	4 0.0	5 6.5
1.45	e.	Your school's daily schedule	n=31	1 64.5	2 25.8	3 7.7	4 0.0	5 0.0
1.62	f.	Building self-concept	n=30	1 44.8	2 44.8	3 6.9	4 0.0	5 0.0
1.66	g.	Discipline procedures	n=32	1 50.0	2 37.5	3 9.4	4 3.1	5 0.0
1.41	h.	Reward programs	n=32	1 62.5	2 34.4	3 3.1	4 0.0	5 0.0
2.34	i.	Conducting home visits/phone calls	n=32	1 15.6	2 37.5	3 43.8	4 3.1	5 0.0
1.97	j.	Using school equipment and other resources	n=32	1 36.7	2 60.1	3 23.4	4 0.0	5 6.3
1.72	k.	Attendance policies	n=32	1 43.8	2 40.6	3 15.6	4 0.0	5 0.0
2.08	l.	Accounting procedures for equipment/supplies	n=30	1 26.9	2 38.4	3 34.6	4 0.0	5 12.3

Did you attend these inservice sessions? Overview on May 15 ____ Overview on May 31 ||||

Campus Inservice on June 1 |||| June 2 ||||

Comments: None 1

HOME VISITS AND PHONE CALLS TO FORMER TEACHERS:

X̄				TO A GREAT EXTENT	TO SOME EXTENT	NOT AT ALL
1.72	5.	The home visit provided information which was useful in teaching the children.	n=32	1 37.5%	2 53.1%	3 9.4%
1.71	6.	The home visit improved the relationship between home and school.	n=32	1 34.4	2 50.0	3 15.6

7. Did anything specific happen which demonstrated this improved relationship?

X̄				AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE
1.75	8.	The information received from the former teacher was useful in teaching the children.	n=32	1 40.6%	2 43.8%	3 15.6%
2.07	9.	Calling former teachers was more useful than making home visits.	n=31	1 25.8	2 41.9	3 32.3

COMMENTS about home visits and phone calls:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENROLLMENT:

10. How many students originally scheduled to be in your first-period class did not show up at all? _____ $\bar{X}$ = 3.66, MED = 3.00 (N=32)
11. How many students were added the first day? $\bar{X}$ = 2.43 After the first day? $\bar{X}$ = 2.19 MED = 1.00 (N=32)
12. Did the late additions affect your teaching effectiveness? (N=39)
    Yes, a lot 12.5% Yes, a little 15.4% No 68.9% Unsure 3.1%
13. If the late additions were detrimental, how?

14. When do you think summer school enrollment should be closed? (N=33)
    27.3 Before the first day
    36.4 On the first day
    24.2 At the end of the first week
    (3.1 Other (Specify) _____

READING TEACHERS

$\bar{X}$	MATERIALS:	EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	POOR
1.64	15. How would you rate the quality of the curricular materials? N=35	1 57.6%	2 30.3%	3 3.0%	4 9.1%	5 0.0%
1.85	16. How would you rate the appropriateness of the materials for your students' functional level? N=33	1 45.5	2 36.4	3 9.1	4 6.1	5 3.0
1.59	17. How would you rate the usefulness of the materials for summer school? N=32	1 57.4	2 25.0	3 12.5	4 3.1	5 0.0

		A GREAT DEAL	OKAY	DID NOT LIKE	NOT APPLICABLE
	18. How did the students like:				
1.45	a. Chicago Mastery Learning Resources System (CMLR) (n=33)	1 54.5%	2 45.5%	3 0.0%	4 0.0%
1.33	b. Scholastic Text Extenders (n=33)	1 66.7	2 33.3	3 0.0	4 0.0
2.44 (1.38)	c. Modern Curriculum Press Primary Books (n=25)	1 37.0 (12.5)	2 22.2 (17.4)	3 0.0	4 40.7

19. Which materials do you feel should be used again? (check any or all)

    38.2% CMLR n=34 — 32.4% Modern Curriculum Press Primary Books n=34
    97.1 Scholastic Text Extenders n=34 — 41.2 Houghton-Mifflin Mini-Books n=34
    5.9 Other n=34 (Specify) _____

20. What did you spend at least 10 minutes a day teaching (on the average) during the time not spent on CMLR?

    32.4 phonics n=34 — 73.5 independent reading n=34 — 44.1 Other (please specify) n=34
    44.1 vocabulary n=34 — 76.5 reading aloud n=34 — _____
    20.6 mixed skill workbooks n=34 — 2.9 plays n=34 — _____

21. Did you have an adequate supply of the standard curricular materials? If not, what did you lack?

22. Were there any materials you did not have that you feel would be helpful for future summer schools?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THANK YOU!
PLEASE RETURN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO: JOHN MAC DONALD, ORE, ADM. BLDG., BOX 79

SUMMER SCHOOL TEACHER SURVEY — MATH N=37

All summer school teachers are being asked to complete this survey. Information from this staff survey will help in planning future summer schools by identifying problems which might be improved upon and strengths which should be built upon in future summer schools. Your responses will be kept confidential. Please respond to the specific questions listed below. Feel free to add comments to any questions.

GENERAL REACTION TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM: (Circle one)

1. In general, how would you rate the summer school's:

$\bar{X}$				WONDERFUL	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	NOT APPLICABLE
1.39	a.	Organization in your school	n=36	1 69.4%	2 22.2%	3 8.3%	4 0.0%
1.84	b.	Effectiveness in improving students' skills	n=37	1 29.7	2 64.8	3 13.5	4 0.0
1.25	c.	Teacher schedule and planning time	n=36	1 77.8	2 19.4	3 2.8	4 0.0
1.43	d.	Pupil-teacher ratio	n=37	1 62.2	2 32.4	3 5.4	4 0.0
1.24	e.	Rewards (calculators)	n=37	1 81.1	2 13.5	3 5.4	4 0.0
1.38	f.	Rewards (scented stickers)	n=37	1 75.7	2 10.8	3 13.5	4 0.0
1.25*	g.	Other rewards (specify any you especially liked): _____	n=25	1 75.0*	2 25.0*	3 0.0	4 4.0

2. What did you like best about summer school this year?

3. What changes are most needed next year?

IN-SERVICE PREPARATION:

4. The following topics were discussed at local in-service workshops. Not every school covered the same topics. Please rate the following topics according to their effectiveness in helping you teach your summer school class.

$\bar{X}$				ESSENTIAL	VERY HELPFUL	FAIRLY HELPFUL	USELESS	NOT COVERED
1.77*	a.	Organization of the program	n=32	1 38.7%*	2 35.5%*	3 25.8%*	4 0.0%*	5 3.1%
2.23*	b.	Grouping of students for reading/math	n=33	1 18.4*	2 35.5*	3 39.4*	4 6.5*	5 6.1
1.99*	c.	Use of the curricular materials in your subject area (reading/math)	n=33	1 37.5*	2 28.1*	3 31.2*	4 3.1*	5 3.0
1.99*	d.	Community School program	n=32	1 28.6*	2 46.4*	3 21.6*	4 3.5*	5 12.5
1.64	e.	Your school's daily schedule	n=33	1 45.5	2 46.4	3 7.1	4 0.0	5 0.0
1.69*	f.	Building self-concept	n=31	1 44.8*	2 41.4*	3 13.8*	4 0.0*	5 6.5
1.72*	g.	Discipline procedures	n=32	1 42.9*	2 35.7*	3 17.9*	4 3.5*	5 12.5
1.77	h.	Reward programs	n=33	1 30.3	2 42.4	3 27.3	4 0.0	5 0.0
2.53*	i.	Conducting home visits/phone calls	n=33	1 15.7*	2 28.1*	3 43.7*	4 12.4*	5 3.0
2.00*	j.	Using school equipment and other resources	n=33	1 25.9*	2 48.3*	3 25.9*	4 0.0*	5 19.2
1.69*	k.	Attendance policies	n=33	1 46.9*	2 37.5*	3 15.7*	4 0.0*	5 3.0
2.04*	l.	Accounting procedures for equipment/supplies	n=33	1 28.5*	2 39.3*	3 32.2*	4 0.0*	5 15.2

Did you attend these inservice sessions? Overview on May 15 1 Overview on May 31 ||||| 1 (6)

Campus Inservice on June 1 ||||| (11) June 2 ||||| (11)

Comments: ATTENDED NONE 1 n=12

HOME VISITS AND PHONE CALLS TO FORMER TEACHERS:

$\bar{X}$			TO A GREAT EXTENT	TO SOME EXTENT	NOT AT ALL
1.86	5.	The home visit provided information which was useful in teaching the children. n=35	1 28.6%	2 57.1%	3 14.3%
1.92	6.	The home visit improved the relationship between home and school. n=34	1 26.5%	2 64.7%	3 8.8%

7. Did anything specific happen which demonstrated this improved relationship?

$\bar{X}$			AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE
1.68	8.	The information received from the former teacher was useful in teaching the children. n=35	1 48.6%	2 37.1%	3 14.3%
1.89	9.	Calling former teachers was more useful than making home visits. n=35	1 37.1%	2 37.1%	3 24.3%

COMMENTS about home visits and phone calls:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENROLLMENT:

10. How many students originally scheduled to be in your first-period class did not show up at all? $\bar{x} = 3.162$, $sd = 2.66$; $med = 2.6875$

11. How many students were added the first day? $\bar{x} = 4.26$, $med = 4.0625$ After the first day? $\bar{x} = 1.89$, $med = 1.00$

12. Did the late additions affect your teaching effectiveness?
Yes, a lot 9.4% Yes, a little 43.8% No 43.8% Unsure 3.1% ($n = 37$)

13. If the late additions were detrimental, how?

14. When do you think summer school enrollment should be closed?
27.0% Before the first day
42.2% On the first day
21.6% At the end of the first week
9.2% Other (Specify) _____

MATH TEACHERS:

X

MATERIALS:

		EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	POOR
2.00	15. How would you rate the quality of the curricular materials? $n=36$	1 47.2%	2 19.4%	3 22.2%	4 9.3%	5 2.8%
2.03	16. How would you rate the appropriateness of the materials for your students' functional level? $n=36$	1 30.6	2 38.9	3 28.2	4 8.3	5 0.0%
2.11%	17. How would you rate the usefulness of the materials for summer school? $n=34$	1 41.2	2 23.5	3 20.6	4 11.8	5 2.9

		A GREAT DEAL	OKAY	DID NOT LIKE
1.617	18. How did the students like: a. Math for Everyone $n=33$	1 33.3%	2 63.6%	3 3.0%
1.743	b. Succeeding in Mathematics $n=35$	1 28.6	2 68.6	3 2.9
1.139	c. Calculator Enrichment $n=33$	1 86.1	2 13.9	3 0.0

19. Which materials do you feel should be used again? (Check any or all)
75.7% Math for Everyone ($n=28$) 89.2% Calculator Enrichment ($n=33$)
54.1% Succeeding in Mathematics ($n=20$) 21.6% Other (Specify) ($n=8$) _____

20. Should any be eliminated?

21. Did you receive an adequate supply of all materials? 80.6% Yes 19.4% No ($n=36$)
If not, what did you lack?

22. Are there any materials not used this summer that you feel would be helpful for future summer schools?

23. What do you see as the strengths of the math program materials?

24. What improvements would you suggest?

25. Did you have questions about implementing the program that were not answered through the inservice or by your building director?
19.4% Yes 80.6% No ($n=31$)
If yes, what?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THANK YOU!
PLEASE RETURN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO: JOHN MAC DONALD, ORE, ADM. BLDG., BOX 79

SUMMER SCHOOL TEACHER SURVEY — OVERALL RESPONSES

All summer school teachers are being asked to complete this survey. Information from this staff survey will help in planning future summer schools by identifying problems which might be improved upon and strengths which should be built upon in future summer schools. Your responses will be kept confidential. Please respond to the specific questions listed below. Feel free to add comments to any questions.

GENERAL REACTION TO THE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM: (Circle one)

1. In general, how would you rate the summer school's:

		WONDERFUL	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	NOT APPLICABLE
a. Organization in your school	N=73	1 54 (74%)	2 16 (22%)	3 3 (5%)	4 0 (0%)
b. Effectiveness in improving students' skills	N=71	1 24 (34%)	2 39 (55%)	3 7 (10%)	4 1 (1%)
c. Teacher schedule and planning time	N=73	1 55 (75%)	2 16 (22%)	3 2 (3%)	4 0 (0%)
d. Pupil-teacher ratio	N=74	1 50 (68%)	2 19 (26%)	3 5 (7%)	4 0 (0%)
e. Rewards (calculators)	N=74	1 60 (81%)	2 10 (14%)	3 3 (4%)	4 1 (1%)
f. Rewards (scented stickers)	N=74	1 59 (80%)	2 10 (14%)	3 5 (7%)	4 0 (0%)
g. Other rewards (specify any you especially liked): _____	N=48	1 36 (75%)	2 9 (19%)	3 0 (0%)	4 3 (6%)

2. What did you like best about summer school this year?

3. What changes are most needed next year?

IN-SERVICE PREPARATION:

4. The following topics were discussed at local in-service workshops. Not every school covered the same topics. Please rate the following topics according to their effectiveness in helping you teach your summer school class.

		ESSENTIAL	VERY HELPFUL	FAIRLY HELPFUL	USELESS	NOT COVERED
a. Organization of the program	N=67	1 30 (45%)	2 23 (34%)	3 12 (18%)	4 0 (0%)	5 1 (1%)
b. Grouping of students for reading/math	N=64	1 16 (25%)	2 23 (36%)	3 17 (27%)	4 3 (5%)	5 5 (8%)
c. Use of the curricular materials in your subject area (reading/math)	N=66	1 30 (44%)	2 18 (27%)	3 15 (23%)	4 2 (3%)	5 1 (2%)
d. Community School program	N=59	1 23 (39%)	2 23 (39%)	3 13 (22%)	4 0 (0%)	5 0 (0%)
e. Your school's daily schedule	N=67	1 36 (54%)	2 25 (37%)	3 6 (9%)	4 0 (0%)	5 0 (0%)
f. Building self-concept	N=65	1 28 (43%)	2 27 (42%)	3 7 (11%)	4 0 (0%)	5 3 (5%)
g. Discipline procedures	N=63	1 29 (46%)	2 23 (37%)	3 9 (14%)	4 2 (3%)	5 4 (6%)
h. Reward programs	N=68	1 33 (49%)	2 25 (37%)	3 10 (15%)	4 0 (0%)	5 0 (0%)
i. Conducting home visits/phone calls	N=68	1 13 (19%)	2 21 (31%)	3 24 (41%)	4 5 (7%)	5 1 (1%)
j. Using school equipment and other resources	N=69	1 16 (24%)	2 30 (44%)	3 14 (21%)	4 0 (0%)	5 9 (13%)
k. Attendance policies	N=68	1 31 (46%)	2 26 (38%)	3 10 (15%)	4 0 (0%)	5 1 (1%)
l. Accounting procedures for equipment/supplies	N=65	1 15 (23%)	2 22 (33%)	3 19 (29%)	4 0 (0%)	5 9 (13%)

Did you attend these inservice sessions? Overview on May 15 2 (4.2%) Overview on May 31 14 (29.2%)
Campus Inservice on June 1 23 (47.9%) June 2 22 (45.8%)

Comments: None 3 N= 48

HOME VISITS AND PHONE CALLS TO FORMER TEACHERS:

		TO A GREAT EXTENT	TO SOME EXTENT	NOT AT ALL
5. The home visit provided information which was useful in teaching the children.	N=70	1 24 (34%)	2 38 (54%)	3 8 (11%)
6. The home visit improved the relationship between home and school.	N=69	1 22 (32%)	2 39 (57%)	3 8 (12%)

7. Did anything specific happen which demonstrated this improved relationship?

		AGREE	NEUTRAL	DISAGREE
8. The information received from the former teacher was useful in teaching the children.	N=70	1 33 (47%)	2 27 (39%)	3 10 (14%)
9. Calling former teachers was more useful than making home visits.	N=69	1 22 (32%)	2 28 (41%)	3 19 (28%)

COMMENTS about home visits and phone calls:

ENROLLMENT:

10. How many students originally scheduled to be in your first-period class did not show up at all? ____ $\bar{x}=3.527$ N=74
11. How many students were added the first day? $\bar{x}=1.689$ After the first day? $\bar{x}=1.743$
12. Did the late additions affect your teaching effectiveness?
N=67 Yes, a lot 7 (10.4%) Yes, a little 21 (31.3%) No 36 (53.7%) Unsure 3 (4.5%)
13. If the late additions were detrimental, how?

14. When do you think summer school enrollment should be closed?
N=73 19 Before the first day (26.0%)
30 On the first day (41.1%)
17 At the end of the first week (23.3%)
7 Other (Specify) (9.6%)

READING TEACHERS

MATERIALS:	EXCELLENT	GOOD	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	POOR
15. How would you rate the quality of the curricular materials?	1	2	3	4	5
16. How would you rate the appropriateness of the materials for your students' functional level?	1	2	3	4	5
17. How would you rate the usefulness of the materials for summer school?	1	2	3	4	5

	A GREAT DEAL	OKAY	DID NOT LIKE	NOT APPLICABL
18. How did the students like:				
a. Chicago Mastery Learning Resources System (CMLR)	1	2	3	4
b. Scholastic Text Extenders	1	2	3	4
c. Modern Curriculum Press Primary Books	1	2	3	4

19. Which materials do you feel should be used again?(check any or all)

____ CMLR ____ Modern Curriculum Press Primary Books

____ Scholastic Text Extenders ____ Houghton-Mifflin Mini-Books

____ Other (Specify) _____

20. What did you spend at least 10 minutes a day teaching (on the average) during the time not spent on CMLR?

____ phonics ____ independent reading ____ Other (please specify)

____ vocabulary ____ reading aloud _____

____ mixed skill workbooks ____ plays _____

21. Did you have an adequate supply of the standard curricular materials? If not, what did you lack?

22. Were there any materials you did not have that you feel would be helpful for future summer schools?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL:

THANK YOU!
PLEASE RETURN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO: JOHN MAC DONALD, ORE, ADM. BLDG., BOX 79

ATTACHMENT I-3

TEACHER RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

COMMENTS TO QUESTIONS ASKED OF:

ALL TEACHERS--PAGES I-22 TO I-41

READING TEACHERS ONLY--PAGES I-42 TO I-44

LEP TEACHERS ONLY--PAGE I-45

MATH TEACHERS ONLY--PAGES I-46 TO I-52

82.25

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES TO THE TEACHER SURVEY--
GENERAL QUESTIONS FOR ALL TEACHERS SURVEYED.

TEACHERS SURVEY

QUESTION NO. 2: WHAT DID YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL THIS YEAR?

Organization of Program

(22) Pupil-teacher ratio*

(3) The schedule was wonderful.

(6) Planning period; planning time was adequate.

(2) Good pay.

(10) Rewards

(10) Organization of the day

(1) Pace

(1) The support

(8) The hours and schedule

(3) Structure

(1) Being able to teach math only

(1) The overall program ran very smoothly

(1) Time to set up rooms

(1) The library time, community school activities

(1) The general format I enjoyed

Curriculum

(7) Teachers (Materials) kit

(1) Being provided with an excellent program to adapt to each child's needs.

(3) Abundance of materials

(2) Specific teaching of skills, teaching the calculator activities

(2) I enjoy using "Math for Everyone"

* NUMBER IN PARENTHESES INDICATES NUMBER OF TEACHERS GIVING THE RESPONSE. SOME COMMENTS WERE SHORTENED OR REWORDED.

Curriculum (Continued)

(1) The CMLR program--it was well planned and organized

(1) The program was challenging, yet fun to teach! It has given me some great experiences to share with my next classes.

(2) The curriculum--sequential, motivating, positive

(6) Excellent reading program

(1) Enough materials were provided (workbooks) so that I could teach--not do paper work. Also direct teach instruction.

Interpersonal and Other

(7) Children's enthusiasm in coming (because of motivators)

(1) Enthusiasm of faculty and staff

(1) The fact that these children were so used to "sitting back," and all of a sudden they were thrown in the limelight and the leaders of their classes.

(1) Support and understanding of Ruth Bailey

(1) Other teachers

(2) Additional income

(1) Opportunity to teach students who need extra attention

(2) The principal, the faculty, the students, five-week session

(1) It was different from what I usually do.

(1) Relaxed atmosphere

(1) Positive attitude of the program! Teachers taught material very creatively and students succeeded! Everyone was happy!

(2) Working with highly professional teachers

(1) Everything

(1) I've enjoyed working with students who were low achievers, as well as discipline problems. The joy of their growth (self-discipline) somewhat academically as well as socially.

(1) Seeing dramatic changes in children's attitudes.

TEACHERS SURVEY

QUESTION NO. 3:
WHAT CHANGES ARE MOST NEEDED NEXT YEAR?

Planning and Inservice

Have supplies available first not last day of staff development days.

Complete hiring before workshops begin.

More information on kids from previous teachers. (It seems that teachers filled out forms at end of school year which were placed in the kids' cumulative folders which we never saw.)

Being more prepared at the start of the program!

More information on students to help in grouping; effort to group in math so that students in one class are on same level.

Instead of making phone calls to teachers, have them fill out information cards about students before school is out.

Students should be enrolled in summer school based on potential benefit. Chronic behavior/learning problems might benefit from a more individually designed program.

Put space for teacher's name, telephone number, and student's date of birth on enrollment card, also year retained in school and in which grade.

The cards for student information. Additional information needed and changes. Grade child will be in for next year, year retained.

I think a much better job could have been done in projecting summer school enrollment so that all teachers could be properly trained.

Cut off enrollment prior to first class day; get supplies earlier.

Get the materials (scissors, paper, thermofax) before students report.

Hire enough teachers at first. Those of us who came late were really frustrated.

Materials should arrive earlier during the planning week instead of the last day or following week (i.e., comprehension workbook for first grade teachers).

Background info on students—if these children were left back at some time, where's all the info teachers have to fill out on them?

Better information on pupil information cards—T. names, address, telephone number, grade for coming here.

QUESTION NO. 3:
WHAT CHANGES ARE MOST NEEDED NEXT YEAR?

Curriculum

Mastery program for Spanish monolingual or dominant children.(2)

More work on math facts.

Reexamine math tests--some are not worded properly and some just confuse the kids.

Calculators were a good idea but need not be used every day. Other forms of enrichment need to be used as the younger students became bored with calculators.

The teacher information card, another workbook--easier calculator material, only certain numeration and problem solving skills and add addition, subtraction, multiplication and division to skills.

For the math program, all textbooks and materials referred to in the module should be available for teacher and student use. When a program is based on one set of materials, and others are provided, it is not as effective.

A program with more concentration on word attack.

Material for the first grade student who is beyond the skills in CMLR.

As a reading teacher, I was disheartened to learn we had to use the CRT as the summative test for students who failed formative tests. My students as well as I felt that the CRT was a lot more difficult to pass. I hope we can develop some summative tests that follow the pattern of the formative tests.

A way to pre-test--we don't know if they already knew what we taught them. Some consistency in the use of the unstructured time, across classrooms and schools.

Next year all students reading below grade level one year or more should be allowed to go.

I don't like the idea of giving the children calculators for coming to school. They should come because they need to.

Second grade students should be placed in first grade reading books--second grade vocabulary is to difficult for slow and non-readers.

Children who don't need math should not be required to come to the Math class, and children who don't need reading should not be required to come to reading.

QUESTION NO. 3:
WHAT CHANGES ARE MOST NEEDED NEXT YEAR?

Curriculum (Continued)

Proofread answers to calculator and problem solving activities—the answers in some cases were incorrect.

Curriculum changes in math.

The Succeeding in Math did not coincide with the objectives in second grade. We had to make a lot of dittos to go along with each objective. The book was of little use.

Correlation between workbooks, tests, and objective taught in math. There needs to be a consistency in this area.

More manipulatives.

The math program and textbook could be better coordinated. Pages of the text to be used could be listed in a printout.

Perhaps third graders should use third grade reading.

Organization of Program

More money for supplies—duplicating paper, transparencies.

Improve transition to and from community school activities.

Coordinating telephone interviews and home visits more efficiently.

Possibly a weekly staff meeting to share experiences and ideas.

I feel the younger students (first, second) should stay with the same teacher. Changing classes tends to excite the little ones and takes away from their concentration in the beginning of each class.

A clear definition of what type of student should be in the specific levels. EX.: (We had difficulty identifying where "past" retainees should be—we had some children who were not retainees.)

Organization of supplies; letting the teacher know in advance that she/he has a job.

I think we need more teachers, so that the class size can be even smaller.

Not break-up one class for recreational activities.

QUESTION NO. 3:
WHAT CHANGES ARE MOST NEEDED NEXT YEAR?

Organization of Program (Continued)

More explanation to teachers of what final reporting forms will be used and how to fill them out on each student.

Reorganize teacher planning time. Thirty minutes is not long enough to sit down and finish a task--need an hour after the children leave instead of 30 minutes before and 30 after.

I feel it would be better for the children, if they had the same teacher for math and reading.

Each teacher having only one group instead of two. Each teacher would teach reading and math.

Perhaps a pre- and post-test could be used for evaluation.

Pupil-teacher ratio. I had 19 and 21 in my classes.

Better organization during movement to/from community school.

No phone calls to former teachers.

Requirements of students for entering summer school...want to and be able to learn.

Reorganize teacher planning time--need one hour after students leave instead of 30 minutes before and after they arrive and depart.

It really disturbs me to reward these students who come every day with a calculator. What about the ones who work hard during the school year?

Lower pupil-teacher ratio (no more than ten--no exceptions).

More coordination with Community School--advanced notice on amount of end of session paperwork required.

Fewer rewards.

QUESTION NO. 3:
WHAT CHANGES ARE MOST NEEDED NEXT YEAR?

Other

No fully integrated special ed. students should come; a Resource child is different and could benefit by coming.

Special provisions for special education students--perhaps smaller classes for those with larger numbers of special ed. students.

Too many (low) resource students to improve skills. If I had a 6:1 I could have done more with these low non-motivated students.

Special ed. students need to be screened carefully to determine if summer school will fill their needs. Structure, time and objectives do not allow for extreme behaviors.

Exercise extreme care and screen resource students for enrollment. No time to cope with behavior problems.

COMMENTS ON INSERVICE

Reading teachers:

Workshops were well planned and necessary in achieving success.

All workshops were very helpful. It would have been much better if we could have had supplies earlier for room preparation, etc.

The May 15 inservice was a nice pep talk, but it could have included more specific information.

The good organization of the director and immediate feedback on teacher concerns was very helpful in helping me teach summer school.

There were a lot of questions about how to group students.

Math teachers:

Problems in teaching the math were due to the Saturday workshop doing too much Rah, Rah AISD and not enough about how to actually use the total program this summer.

Students were grouped according to reading levels which did not help math teachers.

I started June 2--my school already had inservice--I didn't get any information other than by word of mouth by other teachers.

We did as well as we could. We just didn't have a lot of information.

I would prefer an earlier inservice so I could become familiar with the textbooks and have more time to draw on my personal classroom materials. The last two weeks of school were too hectic to gather all the necessary personal materials to use for enrichment.

In math, there needs to be more organization and grouping between grade levels on a campus level. There needs to be a specific time to do this planning (extra time).

I did not attend any inservice. I found out my school on Tuesday night, June 1.

Tell teachers beforehand that they will be using their own materials so they can get them before school is out.

I feel the "self-concept" inservice was a waste of time. Fortunately, it was very short and we spent most of our time doing practical things.

TEACHERS SURVEY

QUESTION NO. 7: DID ANYTHING SPECIFIC HAPPEN WHICH DEMONSTRATED THIS IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HOME AND SCHOOL DUE TO THE HOME VISITS?

Parents reacted to report card more strongly than if there had been no home visits.

(4) I feel from the home visits one got a better understanding of child's needs and about their families and home life.

The visit provided an opportunity to clarify the summer school program and detail the activities of the day. Parents expressed a greater understanding after the meetings.

Greater response with home-visited students.

No, but I feel it is always more helpful and satisfying to the parents when they meet the teachers and hear all the "information"of the school from the teachers. The children like to say that the teacher has been at his/her house also—the smaller children primarily.

The children felt a closer and warmer relationship with me knowing that I had gone to their homes and spoken in their native tongue to their parents! They felt I cared!

I received notes from parents expressing interest in their child's progress.

Improved attendance in one case.

(2) Students who were visited tended to come to school every day and attend better than others.

Three out of four students whose homes we visited did not have any absences.

Attendance was 100% for students visited.

This made the student feel at ease from the beginning.

(12) No.

The phone calling was a problem. Some of my kids could not even tell me their last year's teacher's name. The cards did not show the teacher's name on it. It would be helpful to have the teacher sign her name and phone number on the registration cards.

Some parents were reluctant to share information before summer school started. Two requested school conferences instead.

QUESTION NO. 7 Continued

(3) The parents all liked it that the teachers visited.

Yes, the home visit provided the opportunity for a shy child to meet her teachers in advance. The visit also provided an opportunity for the parent to ask questions and express expectations. The parent was impressed with the caring for her child--hopefully this helped build a positive parent/school relationship for a family newly established in Austin and very anti-busing.

My two children attended a higher percentage of summer school than they had during the regular school year, so there was some improvement. It also helped me to understand them.

Continual notes from parents and parental contact and interest in child's progress.

Only that the children I visited recognized me the first day and greeted me--This perhaps halped them feel a little bit more at home in a new school.

Yes, one child was on medication not noted on school record was discovered during home visit.

I had one student who performed well and had a great change in attitude after the home visit but her skill level stayed the same.

(2) To some extent knowing the child's home situation and environment. I was able to understand why the child was having problems learning or being motivated and what he/she was coping with.

Parents realized that the school staff does care for their child, and allowed them to see their children positively reinforced at summer school.

No. Had no contact with any parent we visited after start of school. Was able to use info I gathered to develop a rapport with those students--however, found other ways to do same with those students--In retrospect, the home visit doesn't appear to have been an essential ingredient which made a difference to me.

During one of our visits an older brother was reluctant to come, but he was eager once told about the calculator. I hear he did well in class, too. Other children were more eager to come, also.

Some parents felt good about summer school because they thought their children would be allowed to progress to the next grade.

I feel the children we visited felt a little more comfortable with us from the beginning because of the visit.

QUESTION NO. 7 Continued

Yes, with a few of the discipline problems the visits made a difference. The children loved it when "their" teacher came. The parents felt it was a real joint effort.

Mother of one student was very appreciative to hear about structure in the summer school and firmness. She came to visit an entire school day.

TEACHER SURVEY

COMMENTS ABOUT HOME VISITS AND CALLS

GENERAL COMMENTS--POSITIVE

-Very helpful in understanding the pupils' problems.

-They both helped in knowing the child better and helping him/her out where a problem was pointed out.

-This worked well in the summer school program considering that the teachers had no access to cumulative folders.

GENERAL COMMENTS--NEGATIVE

-I feel that in the future there should be a more comprehensive info sheet filled out by the regular classroom teacher that follows the child to S. S. Many health problems, etc. were found out weeks after the program had begun.

-These should not be required in the future.

2-I think it is very unfair that the teachers who started late (not their fault) didn't get paid for the 10 hours of work (which included making home visits and phone calls); instead they got paid for 3 hours even though they did the "same" amount of work (only they worked after hours and on weekends).

-I don't think we had adequate time to get our class rolls in order before we were told to select our visits and calls, etc. We needed to make some class changes first.

-The student info cards were much more informative--parents' name--last year teacher and his/her phone number, DOB.

-Many times the student data cards never arrived and this was the only means by which I could plan. I did some teacher visits for students who never showed up.

PHONE CALLS

2-Strengths and weaknesses sheets could provide the same information more effectively.

-Some teachers were very glad to help, yet others did not like being bothered by summer school teachers.

-Most teachers were unavailable. The information given was informative, but not of great assistance.

-It was interesting to talk to the former teacher, but useless as far as dealing with current work habits/discipline problems.

PHONE CALLS - POSITIVE

-Phone calls provided more help in teaching students.

-I got more information (of the type I was looking for) from the former teacher than I did from parents. None of the home visits really helped me in the classroom. Parents did not specifically know what their children were weak in.

-The phone calls were really helpful.

Phone calls: Every teacher has their own way of working with students. My method is usually different in approach with students. It is helpful to a degree, though.

-Most teachers were so eager to talk about their former students. They all knew so much about them. One even called me back to check on progress of students.

PHONE CALLS - NEGATIVE

-The previous teacher should have been notified beforehand to expect the calls and questions, as some were not very cooperative.

3-Some teachers were very negative about certain students. I dreaded meeting those students; luckily, I found those students not to be the "monsters" I was warned about. All the kids were wonderful. The children did not match their descriptions.

-For second, third grade math, teachers expressed a need for emphasis on double-digit addition and subtraction, and basic multiplication facts. However, in summer school we stressed numeration and problem solving.

2 -I believe the information I received through former teacher phone calls could have been given on the cards teachers filled out on retainees before school was out and thus save a lot of time (or some other form).

3 -Former teachers were not receptive to our phone calls. They had all filled out strengths and weaknesses forms which had most of the information we asked for--but these forms remained in cumulative folders and we never saw them!

3 -This took up a great deal of time which could have been used more effectively for planning and preparing materials. They are not useful enough to justify the time.

3 -Phone calls to teachers were difficult because teachers were hard to reach.

4 -Some teachers could not be contacted because they were not at home or were on vacation.

PHONE CALLS - NEGATIVE (Continued)

-Most teachers contacted indicated they had completed the requested information on the pre-enrollment forms filled out before summer school began.

-Since I didn't know the children while talking to the teacher the information didn't really stick with me. I seldom went back to look at the interview form.

-I feel the phone calls could have been avoided with a good report from the previous classroom teachers. By the time the teachers were contacted, we were way into the first week. More knowledge beforehand would have been more beneficial in grouping classes.

2- Many teachers felt bothered or weren't home.

-Many teachers who were contacted had negative things to say and the summer school program really didn't lend itself to having as many problems as I was expecting after the phone calls.

2 -The fact that we had to find the former teacher's name and phone number instead of it being on the card was an inconvenience for us.

-Teachers gave general and vague comments about students.

-Phone calls to former teachers were not very helpful. Many home room teachers did not have the students for math or reading, and had little information to offer. The problem children that many teachers described were not the children we had. I had no discipline problems probably due to the low pupil-teacher ratio. Due to this ratio it doesn't take as long to get to know the kids.

HOME VISITS

-Home visits were interesting but very time-consuming and difficult to schedule.

-I was able to contact parents during the first week.

HOME VISITS - POSITIVE

-I got the impression that parents were encouraged to see us trying to improve the communication between school and home.

2- Home visits played a positive part in summer school.

-I really enjoyed the home visits. It takes parents and teachers to educate those children and the children saw us as a team!!

HOME VISITS - POSITIVE

-Perhaps it was the timing, but I found the visits and calls to parents (I called and talked to all but three of the parents of my students) more positive and useful. Teachers frequently had very negative comments to make, although some were most helpful.

-I enjoyed the home visits because it gave me the opportunity to meet the parents.

-I feel that home visits allow one to gather information on what the child is equipped with in order to work at school or interact anywhere. You know what motivations, strengths and weaknesses come from home and where you as the teacher must interject in order to make school more relevant to students' needs.

-At least in visiting the home I gained first-hand information about the child. The former teachers were cooperative but I did not find the info. helpful in this summer school. Perhaps I would have felt differently if I had had more responsibility for designing the child's program and for placing him/her.

-Home visits were helpful and parents seemed to like them.

-I really liked the home visits. I would love to have the time to visit students' homes for regular school, too.

-The "parent-teacher" relationship was started with a positive attitude. Every teacher relates to different personalities in different ways, but it gave you an idea what to expect after talking to the former teacher.

HOME VISITS - NEGATIVE

-I was not trained enough to make a home visit. The areas where I made home visits were dangerous. The home visits were useless.

-Information I received from those teachers who did the home visits was of no help.

-In our home visits we found out that the parent knew very little about the academic weaknesses and strengths of the child. In all of our visits the child answered most of the questions. I will say that in all instances parents were cooperative and delighted to see the teacher visit the home.

-Not sure home visits were beneficial.

82.25

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL:

Loved teaching it!

I enjoyed it!

Very helpful in understanding the pupils' problems.

I have never taught such well-behaved children. It seems that by having a class of retainees, everyone feels like he is in the "same boat" and it feels so good to "shine" for a change.

1) Need to have thermofax masters of tests in central location to be used by all—spent too much time having each math teacher doing own thing.
2) More hands-on activities.
3) In problem solving, need to concentrate on addition, subtraction, and simple multiplication problems. Use of Solving Math Word Problems (Nystrom) show exact, consistent steps.
4) Teachers called felt children needed computational skills and reinforcement in this area.
5) I had to search and bring my math supplies and activities from my home school.

This is a great program! Having two teachers specialize and trade students is good as is the SMALL CLASS SIZE!

It has been exciting to have been a part of this unique program. Thank you for the privilege.

Great experience.

Loved it!

Math teachers had an excessive amount of paper work compared to reading teachers. Either pay them more or have reading teachers specifically help in some way.

I am delighted I was a part of the summer school program. It was enriching and I really learned a great deal. This fall I plan to implement in my regular classroom the many new and innovative ideas I learned this summer. I'd also like to mention that we were privileged to have such a great principal who guided us through the program very smoothly!

1. I felt that the second grade tests did not test the objective well. They were not easily understood and were too difficult. Many were the same as third grade. There were mistakes on several.

2. We had to take several children that were not on our grade level. I felt the children should be with their grade levels.

I have enjoyed teaching, but it has been hard work because of the math curriculum and ORE forms and expectations for reteaching and record keeping. (We had not been warned to keep percentiles on tests.)

Generally I felt very good about the SS experience. I think the students responded well to the small classes and knowing that all students had at some point been retained seemed to help everyone's self-esteem. I would hope,

however, that students be evaluated in terms of possible benefit from SS before being included.

I'm not sure we can rationalize the cost of the program. Did we help? If we did, was it worth a half a million dollars?

I feel we should have concentrated on addition/subtraction-multiplication/division; not so much problem solving. (Ex.: p. 4, p. 10, p. 11, p. 12, p. 13, etc.) (Grades 5/6)

I found myself making my own materials—especially practice sheets for the students to go with the objectives. There were not enough activities—esp. calculator—for my level students or game (motivational) activities. The last minute progress report sheets are unfair—I am having to file through a mound of papers to find scores!!

Please don't use smelly stickers; the kids spent so much time scratching and sniffing. They were too much of a distraction.

Although the working conditions were nice and the money appreciated/needed, I'm not convinced that a summer school program is really all that effective. And aren't we here for the students? I'm afraid it's all a waste!

Math for Everyone needs a pre and post test (and answers). This program was geared around 3 books which we did not see the other two books (Plus the workbook teaches a different form). I enjoyed teaching summer school—the students and staff were great!

Summer school '82 ran more smoothly than any other summer school program I have seen. It was fun to teach and I feel the students had fun learning. I really saw improvement in skills, self-concept and attitudes.

It was a pleasure for teachers and a great benefit for students.

Student interest was low and misbehavior was high. This interfered significantly with our progress. (5th and 6th graders)

Thank you for letting me have the opportunity to work with these children who so often get forgotten! I've learned that they too are unique, bright and witty! Hopefully their leadership qualities will carry over to next year so other teachers can see that they also have the potential to be great!

Summer school was a definite learning experience for myself as a teacher. I enjoyed concentrating on one subject area. Our school was run superbly by our building supervisor. She was <u>so very</u> supportive, helpful and organized. It made things so very pleasant. I enjoyed <u>all</u> the people I worked with this summer and I do feel the children will leave with many new skills!

It was a great experience. After a few first-year problems are ironed out, this will be an excellent program. I'm very impressed with the time and money AISD has committed to this endeavor.

In general, I think it has been an extremely worthwhile experience, especially in its organization, quality of staff, and overall effectiveness.

82.25
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL: (page 3)

Basically, I think the program was a good one. I got some positive feedback from parents. The kids seemed to enjoy it. The small classes helped children, who are usually very withdrawn in school, to be active participants. I think Special Ed. kids should continue to be a part of the program!

1) Thank you for the opportunities you provided to meet the total needs of the children.
2) I would like to use both reading and math programs in my class next year.

I've really enjoyed participating in this summer school program. It has been extremely well organized and planned. Working with an enthusiastic director like Ida Hunt made the students and teachers enthusiastic and eager to work together. I would recommend not including the integrated child in this program because of the constant one-to-one help each of them require.

I feel that for the short time we had them, it was marvelous. I'd love to pilot this program.

Overall, the program is excellent. Children's attitudes about themselves improved drastically. Parents would call to give positive comments. Many noticed their child was improving in reading and actually loved school for the first time. One boy was up and ready for school by 6:00 AM every day. He never wanted to go during the regular year.

1) CMLR - Format should be consistent for student activity sheets and the Formative Tests. Unit 4 Test (Level 3) was confusing to students.
2) I feel summer school was a very productive and rewarding experience. The students really enjoyed the materials and skills taught.

The summer program has been very productive. The materials (CMLR) were stimulating and motivating. I think that each teacher should teach reading and math to the same group of children to provide a more correlated approach to the summer learning process.

I enjoyed using the CMLR for summer school. It was very effective because of the Direct Teach Procedures. I feel 2nd grade next summer school should use comprehension workbooks somewhere inbetween first and second grade level--or work on some different units in the second grade book. Inference II was too hard for this level.

Fantastic experience. Ruth Bailey was a joy to work for and with. The students were great. Community school was terrific.

It went very well! Our campus director was excellent! I enjoyed it!

It would've been much more helpful for us to have the student progress report sheets before now, or at least be told that we needed to keep track of scores so that completing the forms would be less time-consuming.

I really liked the Reading program. The children enjoyed the work and books.

82.25

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL: (page 4)

I felt very confident in teaching the reading program; however, the "official" forms which had to be completed for grading purposes throughout the program as well as at the end, needed more explanation to be given to the teacher by ORE.

There were more than enough materials to go around. However, my class of students was not high enough to do some of the simplist assignments. The real problem seems to be who was attending summer school--what are the students' needs? Why were they left behind?

Most former teachers were hard to get hold of or really didn't care to be bothered. Many that were contacted had negative things to say and the summer school program really didn't lend itself to having as many problems as I was expecting after the phone calls. The fact that we had to find out the former teacher's name and phone number instead of it being on the card was an inconvenience for us.

1) Rewards were great reading motivators, 2) Recess was a great time to relate to the kids non-academically--they relished this time, 3) I ran the most humanistic classroom I have ever run due to the extra time available--there was virtually no stress on anyone, students or teachers. Students identified as serious behavior problems were easily handled in this setting. Students were on task much of the time.

I found myself coming up with more positive reinforcement ideas to get my students to read paperbacks and it was a success. I shall use this method during my regular scholastic year. I loved the weekly progress report home. Students were eager to share what success they were experiencing here at school with parents. Again let me say that we need to use some form of summative test that patterns after the formative test in reading besides the CRT. I felt very supported by my director, Mr. Mungia, and administrative staff at all times. If any problems arose my answer was given if not that day, the next morning. It was my pleasure to work as a teacher with beautiful kids!

As an overall view the program ran very smoothly and successfully. The in-services and workshops were helpful in preparing us for the program. Working with these children made it a very rewarding summer job.

We were told to order supplies but we weren't told what supplies we would need or that we could go in together and share. (We were told later.) We weren't given a limit. (We were later--had to redo.) It was really disorganized. Our requests were only partially filled but no record was kept on what we were lacking.

I enjoyed teaching the CMLR.
It was interesting and the students enjoyed the units that were taught.

Summer school is good for these underdeveloped skilled kids but it doesn't enhance their need for word recognition and word attack. I find that many students could comprehend after the material had been read to them but were having problems recognizing the words. (in context or out of context)

The students received far too many rewards and "goodies." Summer school was well-organized and I thoroughly enjoyed it. Would love to do it again. Most of my students want to go next year.

A great experience. Materials excellent for students and are exciting and fun to use!

82.25

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL: (page 5)

It was a great experience carefully organized--everything went smoothly--the stickers were great!

The summer school program has proved to be a very well organized, effective teaching program. I have enjoyed being a part of it.

I thoroughly enjoyed the excellent materials, low pupil number, organization, staffing, and all the prior planning that was obviously done.

Our school was well-organized and the faculty was enthusiastic. Overall, I think the program was superior!

I feel that the main factor contributing to the success of the program was small class size.

1. Please do not include behavioral prob. students, unless you provide an outlet (backup) for the classroom teacher; i.e., counselor.
2. Too much paperwork (progress reports, etc.)
3. If Sp. Ed. students are to be included additional arrangements are needed.

Summary:

At least 19 teachers specifically said they loved or really enjoyed the summer program.

Two said they liked specializing on one subject.

Five mentioned the the small classes as a very nice feature.

82.25

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ASKED ONLY OF READING TEACHERS.

READING

20. WHAT DID YOU SPEND AT LEAST 10 MINUTES A DAY TEACHING (ON THE AVERAGE) DURING THE TIME NOT SPENT ON CMLR?

OTHER:

Creative writing.
Study trips.
Story writing.
Children read to classmates from Text Extenders.
One-on-one instruction.
Sight word drill games.
Students made book reports.
Journal writing.
World events and how they affect my students; any significant experience to child during weeks at school.
Book reports--written and oral.
Word attack/Study skills activities.
Language experience.(2)*
Creative writing.
Developing language and concept experiences.

* Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of respondents saying this. If no number is indicated, only one teacher made the comment.

82.25

QUESTION #21. DID YOU HAVE AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF THE STANDARD CURRICULAR MATERIALS? IF NOT, WHAT DID YOU LACK?

YES. (23)
LACKED: (6)
Houghton-Mifflin mini-books
Modern Curriculum Press primary books

Mini books

I needed a comprehension workbook for making copies to use with students.

Skill books on word attack skills should have been provided for students in intermediate grades since these provided for students in intermediate grades since these are very low for this particular student in summer school.

Comprehension workbooks.

R E A D I N G

QUESTION #22. WERE THERE ANY MATERIALS YOU DID NOT HAVE THAT YOU FEEL WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR FUTURE SUMMER SCHOOLS?

No: (11)
Yes: (11)
Mini Books

Master books sold through "Good Books" Store such as Comprehension & Speed and Study Skills (a reading comp. and skills through literature series) were very helpful in the reading program.

I ran a vigorous independent reading program and felt that I did not have enough books even though I supplemented my supply with many books from my home school.

We needed more paper for duplication purposes.

More adequate supply of instructional material. (Ditto paper, thermofax, etc.)

The Word Attack/Study Skills workbook for the students.

The supply allotment should have been $20.00! Workbooks for first grade comprehension.

Scissors, glue, thermofax, ditto paper. Scissors came two weeks late--and there were only two more pages to cut out. By the time you spend all your supply money on these supplies at first grade, you don't have any other money.

More books for the students to read.

It would have been very helpful to have had workbooks for the comprehension units.

Dictionaries.

82.25
RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ASKED OF LEP READING TEACHERS.

LEP

23. DID YOU RECEIVE AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF ALL MATERIALS?

2 Yes, 1 No (Lacked Spanish workbooks)

24. WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE STRENGTHS OF THE MATERIALS USED?

Materials covered the objectives very well. (W) Materials were not in Spanish and not all materials were adequate to use for or with everyone.

The ESL stories were easy, enjoyable, the play and practice seemed good but I didn't have time to use it, "I like English" very colorful and big. (W) Supplemental Readers - not enough in English.

Simple sentence forms, basic vocabulary. (W) Need more for advanced students, higher interest level but still low voc. materials for older children.

25. WERE THERE ANY MATERIALS YOU DID NOT HAVE THAT YOU FEEL WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR FUTURE SUMMER SCHOOLS?

I needed easy English reading books.

Matematica--Silver Burdett

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL:

I enjoyed it.

Loved teaching it.

21. What reading materials should be used again? OTHER:

Listening activities.

82.25

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ASKED ONLY OF MATH TEACHERS.
MATH

19. WHICH MATERIALS DO YOU FEEL SHOULD BE USED AGAIN?

OTHER:

A workbook that coordinates better with Math for Everyone.(2)

Reinforcement.

Calculator workbooks.

I loved the Powers of Ten kit! (2)

All the activity books.

Skill games.

Little Professor calculators.

20. SHOULD ANY MATERIALS BE ELIMINATED?

Succeeding in Mathematics workbooks--they do not go along with the Math for Everyone program. (8)

Yes. Math for Everyone is nothing really new or imaginative. It is a real disappointment.

Succeeding in Mathematics was good. However, we covered some skills that the book did not which made it difficult to teach.

The AISD guides are full of mistakes. They were never proofread.(Gr. 5/6)

I spent hours making my own materials for skills Succeeding in Math did not cover.

Calculator enrichment needs a few more activities for the lower levels (1-2).

Math for Everyone should have included a test for each objective and if it is not completed properly it should not be used. (Gr. 2)

No. (5)

The tests should be re-evaluated to correlate with the workbook or the workbook should be eliminated because it didn't correlate well with the math at level 2.

If problem-solving is a focus next summer, a locally-produced workbook including problem-solving should be used instead of the worksheets.

Succeeding in Math (SIM) does not have enough practice sheets on the specific concepts we were working on.(Gr. 1)

Too much paperwork--test scores were recorded several times--little time for retesting.

Many of the books and resources were not used because they were on too high a level. (Gr. 1 or 3)

20.(Continued)

Math for Everyone needs interesting activities for the objectives.

21. DID YOU RECEIVE AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF ALL MATERIALS? 29 YES 7 NO

IF NOT, WHAT DID YOU LACK?

Ditto paper, transparencies, and thermofax.

Apparently there was some misunderstanding about the stickers. Some were not scented. We were told students could earn 10 per day but we had far less than needed for such a number.

Thermofax and duplicator paper.

Paper, dittos, thermofax masters--I had a lot of good materials I couldn't reproduce.

Ditto paper, pencils, thermofax, etc.

Received booklets, workbooks. Had to run off tests and activities in problem solving and calculator. Had to make materials used to teach various skills.

Textbooks! If we are not to use textbooks, we should not use a program that relies heavily on them.

SUMMARY: Lack of sufficient thermofax masters and ditto paper was mentioned by 4 of the 7 teachers who said they lacked materials.

NOTE: 2 teachers noted that they received sufficient materials but that some were late in arriving.

22. ARE THERE ANY MATERIALS NOT USED THIS SUMMER THAT YOU FEEL WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR FUTURE SUMMER SCHOOLS?

It would be nice to have materials on the first or second day of the workshops.

If the tests could be reproduced on charts it would be great. We had few thermofax here to use. I liked all of the materials.

A math book--not just a workbook.

More manipulatives. (5)

Problem-solving.

Perhaps additional enrichment to be used with the calculator; students occasionally tired of the calculator.

Games on basic facts on addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division need to be bought (like Quizmo). These children need to be drilled daily on their basic facts. Also, materials on measurement.

Unifix blocks, pattern blocks, attibute blocks.

Solving Math Word Problems Levels A,B,C (Nystrom). Need for more reinforcement materials and hands-on activities.

Some problem-solving cards to be used independently or as a center.

A workbook that goes along with Math for Everyone.

A set curriculum instead of 10 supplemental things.

More hands-on materials (ccunters, skill games, walk-on number lines for counting), Little Professor calculators.

SUMMARY: More hands-on materials and manipulatives were mentioned most often.

QUESTION #23. WHAT DO YOU SEE AS THE STRENGTHS OF THE MATH PROGRAM MATERIALS?

I like the structure of breaking the skills into small parts (objectives) and teaching for mastery.

Used fourth level for entire group--made teaching more effective. (Grade 4)

Ideas for manipulative materials.

The "hands-on" --"experience" ideas and usage.

Broad--yet specific--included tests.

Organization and variety in instructional methods.

Excess of books to choose from.

The teacher has a variety of materials from which to choose in order to present her lessons more effectively.

Math for Everyone was excellent.

It certainly forced me to be creative. (Grades 5/6)

Mastery approach; however, some of the skills for the level seemed very easy while others seemed to be 1 or 2 years beyond the level. (Grade 4)

Concise tests/clear stated objectives--they're short enough to cover and test in a day. Each area is divided into several objectives that cover each area over all. (Grades 5/6)

The structured lessons.

The systematic way "Math for Everyone" approached the skills. (Grade 2)

Reinforcement and minicalculator handouts.

The sequencing order was excellent. The immediate testing was great. The calculators motivated my kids. (Grade 2)

The "Math for Everyone" program is very appropriate and effective in meeting the needs of all children at their own pace. (Grades 5/6)

Everything we needed was here for us. The book was missing some of the skills we taught. But overall it was great! (Grade 4)

Stressing numeration and problem solving is important, but these levels could not add and subtract. (Grade 3)

Calculator enrichment.

Less planning time is required and the program is thorough, interesting, and can be used for any amount of time necessary. (Grade 1)

The materials were thorough and accessible. It made math fun and interesting for teachers as more time could be spent creating motivating material and working

QUESTION NO. 23 (page 2)

with student needs. (Grade 1)

The material was geared toward teaching low achievers.

Concise, well thought out, motivating, and many opportunities for enrichment.(Gr. 1)

"Math for Everyone" was very good because I liked the way the objectives were outlined for us. By this, we could concentrate on those specific objectives the children really needed. (Grade 1)

Focuses and concentrates on specific skills.

The clear organization scope and sequence. The hierarchical grade level arrangement.

I like the way Math for Everyone states objectives for each grade level--but it doesn't really provide many activities for these. (Grade 1)

The varied activities to choose from.

The systematic approach to locating and meeting individual needs. (Grade 2)

Tests and recording system.

Word problems and calculator activities.

Summary:

Math for Everyone mentioned specifically five times.

TEACHERS SURVEY - MATH

QUESTION #24. WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WOULD YOU SUGGEST?

(GR. 2) A more structured program--like the reading is laid out.

(GR. 1) Provide materials for assessment of objectives mastered at all grade levels.

(GR. 1) Coordinate the test materials more closely.

(GR. 1 or 3) Better games for skill practice and better calculator activities than those provided and more and better motivator ideas. The booklet provided was inadequate.

(GR. 1) Tests need to be coordinated with strands.

(GR. 3) Use another program!

(GR. 3) Tests should match skills better--if you had not locked at the test before teaching skill, you might emphasize something diff. There were not enough activities given for the skills--if you spent more than one day on a skill, you had to come up diff. activities. Because the workbooks didn't match the skills every time, I spent a lot of time making up ind. work.

(GR. 4) Order workbooks that go with the objectives taught.

(GR. 2) The Math for Everyone activities did not jive with the mastery tests--specifically P5 green. Succeeding in Math offered no practice in graphing and did not jive with the objectives in teaching fractions.

(GR. 5/6) Find a workbook that is more self explanatory. It had to be taught--It was not a practice or reinforcer at all. In a class working in different workbooks (2 groups), it was impossible to find practice pages for the children to do independently on the subject being studied.

(GR. 2) A workbook that goes along with Math for Everyone.

(GR. 2) The math program and textbook could be better coordinated. Pages of the text to be used could be listed in a printout. It was unfortunate that some of the textbook pages for fractions could not be used in the classroom but were to be completed at home. Also, the P5 lesson graphing did not have the goals that were expected on the test. (Math for Everyone). I feel that "math facts" could also be taught. I found most of my children needed to learn/practice them before they could do problem solving.

Have more manipulatives and workpages available.

More explanation as to how to implement program.

Because of time limitations, the overall math program would be more successful if a system of grouping the children more to their functional level could occur.

OUESTION #24. (Page 2)

That levels of performance be an important aspect to look at, and not so much the grade when dividing the children into classes.

A great percent of my students could not add, subtract, multiply, or divide. Therefore it is hard to teach word problems without this background. These need to be added to the summer programs and omit some of the skill in numeration and problem solving--there are too many skills in the upper grades--calculators: material and booklets were too hard--teacher needs to be able to help in selecting material too.

More followup activities for objectives not covered in the workbooks.

No integrated special ed. students. Limit the number of very low, non-motivated special ed. students.

Perhaps a format that would not require almost daily testing. Many of the students quickly tired of "another test," even short ones.

In the lower levels we need to work with fewer objectives in Math. Maybe if we just concentrate on 10 or fifteen objectives we could be more successful.

A test booklet already made for each child. Much more manipulatives available. A ditto book of math tests to run off for those who did not master the test the first time.

More manipulatives for students working at very low level.

Help in coordinating tests, record keeping, etc.

1) Need to have thermofax masters of tests in central location to be used by all--spent too much time having each math teacher doing own thing 2) More hands-on activities 3) In problem solving, need to concentrate on +, -, and simple X problems. Use of Solving Math Word Problems (Nystrom) show exact consistent steps. 4) Teachers called felt children needed computational skills and reinforcement in this area. 5) I had to search and bring my math supplies and activities from my home school.

   Lots more manipulatives are needed--clocks, scales, charts, etc.

Summary:

Better coordinated tests mentioned five times.
Better coordination of workbooks and objectives mentioned five times.
More skill practice sheets mentioned five times.

Summer School Pilot Project

Appendix J

PARENT SURVEY

82.25

Instrument Description: Parent Survey

Brief description of the instrument:

The Parent Survey was designed to assess parent perceptions of their experience with the 1982 Summer School for retainees. The survey contains seven items concerning general reactions to the program, the effects of the home visit from the teacher on parent behavior, and information about the follow-up activities which parents received and completed. The survey is contained in Attachment J-1.

To whom was the instrument administered?

The parents of half of the summer school students were randomly selected and administered the survey. A total of 547 surveys were sent out. All parents received both the English and Spanish version of the questionnaire.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

When was the instrument administered?

The survey was mailed out to parents on August 16, 1982, two weeks after the last follow-up activity was sent out and five weeks after summer school classes ended.

Where was the instrument administered?

The survey was sent to parents at their home address.

Who administered the instrument?

The survey was self-administered.

What training did the administrators have?

N/A.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

No problems are known to exist with the instrument.

Who developed the instrument?

Office of Research and Evaluation staff.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

PARENT SURVEY

Purpose

The Parent Survey was designed to provide information pertinent to the following decision and evaluation questions:

Decision Question D2: Was the structure of summer school appropriate for future summer schools? Are alterations necessary?

Evaluation Question D2-11: How did parents like summer school?

Evaluation Question D2-12: What effect did the home visit have on parents' activities with their children?

Evaluation Question D2-13: Did parents receive information about activities to do with their children for the rest of the summer after summer school was completed? How much did they complete?

Decision Question D4: Should retainees be encouraged to attend summer school?

Evaluation Question D4-5: Can any variables be identified that relate to student achievement?

Procedure

With the above questions in mind, ORE staff generated survey items which were likely to tap general reactions to the program, activities produced by a visit from the summer school teachers, and information about completion of follow-up procedures. The survey was distributed for comment to other ORE staff and summer school coordinators. A Spanish version of the survey was produced and the translation verified by several Spanish-speaking ORE staff members.

Summer school students' ID numbers were matched against numbers appearing on the 1981-82 end-of-year Student Family File. This file was used to generate labels containing the student's address. Several students did not have ID numbers. Several attempts were made to obtain these students' addresses through information from teacher records, and when these addresses were obtained, labels were generated. Only one label was generated for each family, regardless of the number of siblings in summer school.

Labels were generated for the parents of a randomly selected sample representing half of all the summer school students. One group excluded from the survey are the parents of students with either no student ID number and no teacher-obtainable address, or those with no address on the Student Family File. For these students, no address was obtained.

The surveys were sent by U. S. mail on August 16, 1982 and were returned by parents in a pre-addressed, stamped envelope to ORE. All English-language surveys received by October 15 were keypunched, and frequencies were generated for each objective response. Spanish-language surveys were scored by hand because only seven were returned.

Results

A total of 119 of the 547 parent surveys sent out were returned, for a return rate of about 22%. There were seven Spanish-language surveys and 112 English-language surveys returned. Parents' responses to objective items are summarized in Attachment J-1, and parents' comments are reproduced in Attachment J-2. Results are discussed below in terms of each evaluation question.

Evaluation Question D2-11: How did parents like summer school?

Parents generally had a favorable overall impression of summer school; 92 of the respondents to the English-language questionnaire (87.7%) rated the summer school as "Wonderful" or "Pretty Good" and five respondents to the Spanish-language questionnaire (71.4%) rated the summer school as "Wonderful" or "Pretty Good." One parent responded that summer school was "Not Very Good"; this parent felt this way because students "should not have to take both reading and math."

Parents were asked to choose which three of 15 features they liked best about summer school. These features were ranked according to respondent selection, and the rankings and percent of respondents choosing each feature are given in Figure J-1. Math class, reading class, and learning to use a calculator were the features chosen by most respondents to both forms of the survey.

Parents were asked several questions about the school schedule and about how their child got along in summer school. Most of the respondents to the English form felt that the length of the school day was just right (95 parents, or 84.8%), although 14 (12.5%) felt that the school day was too short. About three out of four parents felt that five weeks is just the right amount of time for summer school, but 26 (23.2%) thought five weeks was too short a time. All respondents to the Spanish-language survey felt that the length of the school day was just right and that five weeks was just the right amount of time for summer school. Most of the English-form respondents felt that the beginning of the summer is the best time for

summer school (80 or 71.4%); 27 (24.1%) would have preferred it to be held in the middle of summer, and 5 (4.5%) would have preferred it to be held at the end of the summer. Two of the Spanish-form respondents (40%) felt the beginning of summer was the best time, but two felt that the middle was best, and one preferred the end of summer.

Almost all respondents reported that their child liked the classes (109 or 97.3%), liked the teachers (110 or 95.5%), and liked the other students (107 or 95.5%).

RANK	PERCENT CHOOSING THIS ITEM	ITEM
1	58.0	Math class
2	52.9	Reading class
3	42.0	Child learning to use a calculator
4	39.5	Small classes
5	28.6	Teachers got child interested in school
6	27.7	Students rewarded with calculators
7	26.1	Child learned a lot
8	18.5	Weekly treats for attending
9.5	12.6	Community school activities
9.5	12.6	Chance for child to make friends
11	9.2	Other (Increased child confidence: 3.9%, Lots of attention: 2.6%, Getting Calculators, 2.6%, 10 Other comments; See Attachment J-2 for complete list.)
12.5	8.4	School library
12.5	8.4	Place where child would be with adults
14	7.6	Having chance to talk with teacher

Figure J-1. PARENTS' RESPONSES TO "WHAT THREE THINGS DID YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL?" N=119. Spanish-language survey respondents and English-language survey respondents did not differ in their rankings of these features, so both were combined. The only options not selected by any respondents were "Math Class explained in Spanish" and "Reading Activities in Spanish." These only applied to parents of students in LEP classes (39).

Evaluation Question D2-12: What effect did the home visit have on parents' activities with their children?

The rationale for and procedure used by teachers in making home visits is contained in Appendix E. Of the 1,141 students attending summer school, 144 or 12.6% were assigned to receive a home visit by both the student's math and reading teachers (Appendix B). According to teacher reports, about 96% of attempted home visits resulted in a meeting with parents (Appendix I).

Parents were asked if they had received a visit from their child's teacher, and 19 (13.4%) responded that they had. More than half (four or 57.1%) of the parents responding to the Spanish-language form reported receiving a visit from their child's teacher.

Of the 19 parents receiving a visit from their child's teachers, ten (52.6%) reported that the visit caused them to do something different with their child. Of these, five (83.3%) reported that they helped their child practice math more often, four (66.7%) reported reading to their child more often, two (33.3%) reported that they were more strict about bedtime rules, and two (33.3%) reported that they made sure that their child ate well. When asked if they thought teachers should visit with parents during future summer schools, 90 parents (75.6%) thought that they should. Those who believed teachers should make home visits thought that parents get information about what goes on in summer school, that they learn ways they can help their child to achieve, that they feel they can participate in their child's achievement, that it helps build rapport between parents and teacher, that the teacher gets information about their child, and that it is an opportunity for problems to be resolved. The parents who did not think teachers should make home visits felt that teachers had no time, that the time could be better spent in lesson planning, that phone contacts would be more convenient, or that it would be easier for parents to visit the school. One parent objected to home visits because teachers "can work better if they have no (preconceived) opinion about the child." These comments by parents may be found in Attachment J-2.

It is interesting to compare these results with teachers' responses to the Teacher Survey, reported in Appendix I. Most of the math and reading teachers (88%) believed that the home visit had improved the home-school relationship. In addition, most teachers (91% of the reading, 86% of the math, and 100% of the LEP teachers) believed that they received useful information from the home visit. Many teachers (30) reported that children receiving home visits seemed to be more comfortable in school, that children had better attendance, and that parents seemed more interested in school, although 12 teachers responding did not observe any specific differences between children whose parents received home visits and those who had not.

Evaluation Question D2-13: Did parents receive information about activities to do with their children for the rest of the summer after summer school was completed? How much did they complete?

Follow-up activities were designed to provide continuing support for what the child had learned during summer school so that the students would not decline in achievement over the school break. Parents received ideas on how to work with their children in reading and math for the rest of the summer. Classes of students were randomly assigned to receive a general or a specific form of follow-up to allow comparisons of the effectiveness of the two types of follow-up.

In math, all students were allowed to take home their math workbook. A letter was also sent home with the students on the last day of class indicating recommended activities to work on in the workbook in specific math areas for the rest of the summer. Half of the parents received this general letter plus a follow-up letter each week in the mail with specific instructions for workbook pages concerning one math area.

In reading, all students were given a letter to take to their parents on the last day of class which gave general ideas on how to help their child with reading for the rest of the summer. The other half received this general letter plus reading activities to work on with their child each week for five weeks through the mail. Actual letters and activities are shown in Appendix E of the first report.

Parents were surveyed concerning which follow-up letters they received and which activities they were able to complete. In reading, 34 parents (33.3%) reported that they received only the last-day letter but no weekly follow-up, 39 parents (37.9%) received both the last day letter and the weekly follow-up; finally, 30 parents said they received no follow-up (three had moved and stopped attending the program). Letters probably never got home with the students on the last day of class in most of these cases. A few teachers may also have neglected to send the letters home.

Most parents receiving reading follow-up had their children list new words from their reading (30 parents or 76.9%); 64% reported that they had their children make a picture from a story they had read; 46% had their children do the "comic strip stories" activity, 41% did the "Read Through the Forest" activity, and 18% did the book list.

In math, 38 of the 119 parents responding (31.9%) said they received a general letter on the last day of summer school but no specific follow-up letters with instructions for the exercises. Another 40 parents (33.6%) said they received both the general letter and the weekly follow-up letters. The rest of the parents (41 or 34.5%) said they received no letters, and a few said they did not receive workbooks. Again, all students were to take home their workbooks and the general letter, but some apparently did not do so or their parents did not recall receiving them.

The number and percent of parents completing at least one page in each follow-up area is shown in Figure J-2. It was not feasible to list the actual pages completed because many parents simply checked areas worked on. As Figure J-2 shows, the number of parents reporting completed work increased markedly as the follow-up became more specific. Only 9.8% of those receiving the workbook but no follow-up letters completed any pages, while 42.1% of those receiving the general letter and 75% of those receiving the general and weekly letters completed at least one exercise. Overall, 50 parents (42%) said they completed at least one activity in the areas listed on the survey.

	NO FOLLOW-UP REPORTED		GENERAL LETTER		GENERAL AND WEEKLY LETTERS		TOTAL	
AREA	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Addition (Grades 1-6)	4	9.8%	8	21.1%	24	60.8%	36	30.3%
Subtraction (Grades 1-6)	4	9.8%	7	18.4%	25	62.5%	36	30.3%
Multiplication (Grades 4-6)	-	-	7	18.4%	15	37.5%	22	18.5%
Division (Grades 4-6)	-	-	4	9.5%	10	25.0%	14	11.8%
Time (Grades 1-3)	1	2.4%	4	9.5%	15	37.5%	20	16.8%
Money (Grades 1-3)	2	4.8%	5	13.2%	21	52.5%	28	23.5%
Fractions (Grades 1-6)	1	2.4%	2	5.3%	14	35.0%	17	14.3%
Geometry (Grade 3)	1	2.4%	1	2.6%	9	22.5%	11	9.2%
Measurement (Grades 4-6)	-	-	2	5.3%	8	20.0%	10	8.4%
Graphs	-	-	1	2.6%	3	7.5%	4	3.4%
TOTAL	4/41	9.8%	16/38	42.1%	30/40	75.0%	50/119	75.0%

Figure J-2. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PARENTS REPORTING COMPLETED FOLLOW-UP WORK WITH THEIR CHILDREN. All percents are reported in terms of the total number of parents receiving each type of follow-up. A total of 112 English and 7 Spanish questionnaires are included.

As Figure J-2 shows, parents most often reported working on addition, subtraction, and money exercises.

Parents were asked how much they think their children learned from these follow-up activities. A slight majority of parents (50 or 55.6%) reported they thought their child learned a lot, 35 or 38.9% said their child learned a little, and 5 (5.6%) said they didn't think their child learned much. These five parents did not report their reasons for thinking their child did not learn very much. A majority of parents (51, or 68%) reported they enjoyed working on the follow-up activities a lot; and another 22 (29.3%) reported that they enjoyed the activities a little. Only two parents reported that they didn't like the activities, and only one of these parents gave a reason for not liking the activities: they "didn't know what they were for."

Evaluation Question D4-5: Can any variables be identified that relate to student achievement?

Information with relevance to parent activities and student achievement is not available at this time, but may be available in spring 1983. Results from the Parent Survey will not be directly applicable as there is no means by which survey responses can be matched to specific children. It may be possible, however, to compare the achievement of students whose parents were assigned to receive weekly follow-up activities with students who were assigned to have only the last day follow-up letter sent to their parents.

Summary

In general, parents were positive about the summer school. Parents liked the following features in particular:

- reading and math classes
- calculators
- small class size
- the teachers (and their ability to get the students interested)
- the length of the school day
- the timing of summer school and length of the session
- the idea of home visits.

When asked about follow-up activities, 40% and 34% of the respondents reported receiving weekly activities in reading and math, respectively. About three-fourths reported completing at least one activity. About half (56%) of the parents felt the child learned a lot from the activities, with 40% learning a little (in the parents' opinion). Most enjoyed working with their child.

PARENT SURVEY (English Responses)

The Austin public schools would like to know how you felt about summer school this year. This will help us improve future summer schools. We won't reveal what you personnally said; we'll only report how all parents felt about each question. Please answer the questions on either the English or Spanish version of the survey and return it in the enclosed envelope by August 27th. If you have more than one child who went to summer school, only answer these questions for the child whose name is on the envelope this survey came in.

N=105 1. How would you rate this year's summer school? (Circle one word)

Wonderful	Pretty Good	Okay	Not Very Good	Awful
49 (46.7)	43 (41.0)	12 (11.4)	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)

N=112 2. What three things did you like best about this year's summer school? (Place a check mark next to your choices)

Rank		
4	47 (40.9)	Small classes
2	60	Reading class (53.6%)
1	62	Math class (55.4%)
9.5	15 (13.4)	Community School Activities (recreation and other activities)
14	7 (6.3)	Having the chance to talk to the teacher
7	29 (25.9)	My child learned a lot
6	30 (26.8)	The teachers got my child interested in school
9.5	15 (13.4)	The chance for my child to make new friends
12	10 (8.9)	The library at school
3	48 (42.9)	My child learning to use a calculator
5	32 (28.6)	Students receiving calculators as a reward
8	21 (18.8)	Weekly treats for attending
13	8 (7.1)	A place for my child where I knew he or she would be with adults
16	0 (0.0)	Math class explained in Spanish
15	1 (0.9)	Reading activities in Spanish
11	14 (12.5)	Other? _____

_____

3. Complete the following sentences by putting a circle around the letter that makes the sentence true:

N=111 a. I think the school day was _____.
(a) too long 2 (1.8) (b) just right 95 (84.8) (c) too short 14 (12.5)

N=111 b. I think that five weeks of summer school is _____.
(a) too long 0 (0.0) (b) just right 85 (75.9) (c) too short 24 (22.2)

N=112 c. I think summer school works best when it's held at _____ of summer.
(a) the beginning 80 (71.4) (b) the middle 27 (24.1) (c) the end 5 (4.5)

N=111 d. My child _____ the classes.
(a) liked 109 (97.3) (b) didn't like 2 (1.8)

N=111 e. My child _____ the teachers.
(a) liked 110 (95.5) (b) didn't like 2 (1.8)

N=109 f. My child _____ the other students.
(a) liked 107 (95.5) (b) didn't like 2 (1.8)

4. Did your child's summer school teacher come to visit you before the beginning of summer school? (check one)
N=112 15 (13.4) Yes 97 (86.6) No.

If so, did the visit cause you to do anything different with your child related to school? N=44 9 (20.5) Yes 35 (79.5) No.

If yes, what? (check any that you now do more):
9 (8%) Read to my child more often
4 (3.6) Take my child to the library more often
15 (13.4) Help my child practice math more often
11 (9.8) Am stricter about bedtime rules
10 (8.9) Am sure my child eats better
4 (3.6) Other _____
_____

N=105 5. Do you think teachers should come and visit parents to talk about school during future summer schools? 86 (81.9) yes 19 (18.1) no

Why or why not?

N=103 6. What information did you receive about reading activities to do with your child after the summer school was over?

34 (33) My child brought home a letter on the last day of summer school about reading activities to do for the rest of the summer;

22 (21.4) I received activities to work on with my child for five weeks in a row;

30 (29.1) I did not get either of these.

17 (16.5) Both 1+2

If you received reading activities, which ones were you able to complete with your child?

N=39

18 (46.2) Comic-strip stories;

7 (17.9) Diving-board book list;

16 (41.0) Read through the forest;

30 (76.9) List new words from your reading;

25 (64.1) Make a picture from a story you read.

7. What information did you receive about math activities to do with your child after summer school was over?

N = 114

36 (32.1) My child brought home a letter on the last day of summer school about math activities to do for the rest of the summer.

35 (31.3) I received activities to work on with my child for five weeks in a row in math.

41 (36.6) did not get either of these.

If you received instructions about math activities, were the instructions correct? That is, did the page numbers appear to be correct?

If you received information about math activities, which pages in the workbook did you work on?

Area	Page Numbers
Addition	30
Subtraction	31
Multiplication	26
Division	13
Time	18
Money	23
Fractions	16
Geometry	7
Measurement	9
Graphs	4

See Figure J-2 for more information

How much do you think your child learned from these activities ?

A Lot	A Little	Not Much	Nothing
50 (55.6)	35 (38.9)	5 (5.6)	0 (0.0)

Did you enjoy working on these activities with your child?

Yes, a Lot	Yes, a Little	No
51 (64.0)	22 (29.3)	2 (2.7)

8. If your child was enrolled in bilingual classes this summer, would you like your child to receive bilingual instruction in future summer schools?

29 (55.8) yes 23 (20.5) no

Do you have any other comments or ideas about changes in future summer schools?

Thanks! Please return as soon as possible.

ENCUESTA PARA LOS PADRES (Spanish Responses)

Al personal de las Escuelas Públicas de Austin le gustaría saber cuales son sus opiniones con respecto al Programa Escolar del Verano este año. Esto nos ayudará a mejorar el Programa Escolar del Verano en el futuro. No revelaremos su nombre, solo reportaremos los opiniones de todos los padres sobre cada pregunta. Por favor conteste las preguntas ya sea en Inglés o Español y regrésela en el sobre adjunto antes del 27 de agosto.

Si mas de un niño en su familia asistió a la escuela de verano, por favor conteste las preguntas para cada uno, de acuerdo con el nombre que aparece en el sobre.

N=7 1. ¿Como calificaría usted la escuela de verano este año? (Marque la respuesta)

MARAVILLOSA MUY BUENA 5 (71.4) REGULAR 2 (28.6) NO TAN BUENA TERRIBLE

N=7 2. Indique las tres cosas que mas le gustaron de la escuela de verano este año.

Rank

_____ clases pequeñas
III (42.9) clases de lectura
1 HH I (85.7) clases de matemáticas
_____ actividades de la escuela de comunidad (recreación y otras actividades)
5.5 II (28.6) haber tenido la oportunidad de hablar con la maestra
5.5 II (28.6) mi niño aprendio mucho
2 IIII (57.1) las maestras hicieron que mi niño se interesara en la escuela
_____ la oportunidad que tuvo mi niño de hacer nuevos amigos
_____ la biblioteca de la escuela
5.5 II (28.6) mi niño aprendio a usar la calculadora
8.5 I (14.3) los estudiantes recibieron una calculadora de regalo
8.5 I (14.3) regalitos semanarios por asistir a la escuela de verano
5.5 II (28.6) tener un lugar seguro donde sabía que los niños estarían con adultos
_____ ¿alguna otra cosa que le gusto? ① que era alumno; ② que mis niños trabieron la oportunidad de tratar otros niños de diferentes escuelas; ③ que lograron que mi hijo se interesara mas en leer;

3. Completa las siguentes oraciónes con un circulo en la letra que hace la oración cierta:

N=7 a. Yo pienso que el día escolar fue _____
(a) demasiado largo (b) de duración adecuada HH II (100.0) (c) demasiado corto

N=6 b. Yo pienso que cinco semanas de escuela de verano son _____
(a) demasiado tiempo (b) el tiempo adecuado HH I (100) (c) muy poco tiempo

N=5 c. Yo pienso que la escuela de verano funciona mejor si comienza _____
(a) al principio del verano II (40.0) (b) a mediados del verano II (40.0) (c) al final del verano I (20.0)

4. ¿Fue la maestra a visitarlos al comienzo de la escuela de verano? III SI (60.0) III NO

N=5 Si su respuesta fue "SI", ¿le motivó esta visita a hacer algo distinto con su niño en relación a la escuela? IIII SI (80.0) I NO (20.0)

Si contesto "SI" a la pregunta anterior, favor de indicar (una o mas respuestas) lo que hizo con su niño.

_____ le leí mas frecuentemente
_____ lo llevé a la biblioteca mas frecuentemente
IIII (100.0) le ayudé con la matemática
I (25.0) fui estricto con las horas de dormir
III (75.0) procuré que comiera bien
_____ ¿alguna otra cosa? ① que se acostara temprano para que estubiera a tiempo en la escuela; ② solo que yo visite a la maestra de mi hija y me dio a conocer lo que mi hija no sabía y le ayudé

5. ¿Piensa Usted que los maestros deben de venir a visitar y platicar con los padres sobre la escuela de verano en el futuro? III SI (75.0) I NO (20.0)

6. ¿Que información recibió Usted sobre las actividades de lectura que Usted puede llevar a cavo con su niño despues de que termine la escuela de verano?

HHT (71.4) El ultimo día de escuela mi niño trajo a la casa una carta con actividades para el resto del verano.
II (42.9) Recibí actividades de lectura para cinco semanas.
_____ No recibí ninguna información sobre actividades de lectura.

Si Usted recibió actividades de lectura, ¿cuales pudo completar con su niño?

1	Comic Strip Stories
	Diving-Board Book List
	Read Through the Forest
1	List new Words from Your Reading
1	Hacer un dibujo sobre uno de los cuentos que leó

7. ¿Que información recibió Usted sobre las actividades de matemáticas para hacer con su niño despues que termino la escuela de verano?

2	El ultimo día de escuela mi niño trajo a la casa una carta con actividades de matemáticas para hacer juntos el resto del verano.
5	Yo recibí actividades para hacer con mi niño para cinco semanas.
	No recibí ninguna información sobre actividades de lectura.

Si Usted recibió instrucciónes sobre actividades de matemátjcas, ¿estaban las instrucciónes correctas? Por ejemplo, los numeros en las páginas aparecieron estar bien? NO

Si Usted recibió información sobre actividades de matemáticas, ¿cuales páginas del manual de ejercicios trabajo?

Suma (Addition)	6 1
Resta (Subtraction)	5
Multiplicación (Multiplication)	2
División (Division)	1
Tiempo (Time)	2
Dinero (Money)	3
Fracciónes (Fractions)	1
Geometria (Geometry)	4
Medidas (Measurement	1
Gráficos (Graphs)	

¿Cuanto le parece a Usted que su niño aprendio de estas actividades?

Mucho	Un Poco	No Mucho	Nada
5	2		

¿Le gustó a Usted trabajar en estas actividades con su niño?

Si, Mucho	Si, Un Poco	No
7		

8. ¿Le gustaría a Usted que su niño recibiera instrucción bilingue en escuela de verano en el futuro? 5 SI 1 NO

¿Tiene Usted ideas o comentarios con respecto a cambios en la escuela de verano para el futuro?

(1) EN LO QUE AMI RESPECTA (NO) PUES MI HIJA ESTUVO MUY CONTENTA Y APRENDIO A CONOCER NUMEROS Y COLORES Y TUBO MUCHO ENTUSIASMO EN VENIR A LA ESC. DE VERANO. A PESAR DE QUE HABIA IDO TODO EL AÑO A LA ESC. SIMPRE ESTABA LISTA PARA LA HORA DE LA ESC. DE VERANO. ESO QUIERE DECIR TODO ESTUVO EN ORDEN CME REFIERO LOS TRATOS DE LAS MAESTRAS Y AL TRABAJO.

(2) QUE HUBIERA MÁS MAESTROS QUE HABLEN ESPAÑOL PARA QUE ABRIGA A MAS COMUNICACIÓN GRACIOS.

(3) NO.

(4) TODO ESTA BIEN, SOLO QUE SI SE PUDIERA QUE RECOGIERAN A LOS NIÑOS, PUES HAY UN POCO DE PROBLEMA PARA NOSOTROS. GRACIAS.

Gracias y por favor recuerde de regresar la encuesta lo mas pronto posible.

82.25

2. WHAT THREE THINGS DID YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT THIS YEAR'S SUMMER SCHOOL?

"OTHER" RESPONSES":*

3 - increased child confidence
- teachers were concerned and spent time with children
- social skills increased
- typing for my fifth grader

2 - receiving calculators
- the fact that my son (daughter) was able to get some help in reading and math
- he showed more progress during summer school than he did in regular school
- "He attended first day only because my sister was sick and we had to leave for Odessa. We stayed three weeks and he was staying behind so he didn't go back."
- "I think the treats kind of helped them in not feeling so bad about going to summer school since they had just got out of public school."

2 - a lot of attention
- "Just the idea of my son going to summer school to learn
- "My child had mixed feelings--very worried about being labeled "bad" because of his participation--the other children seemed rough to him, and he felt grouped with them."
- That it was bilingual
- That my child was very enthusiastic about attending summer school from day one.
- That you accomplished to get my child interested in reading.
- That my children had a chance to interact with different children from other schools.

* Number with response is always one unless another number is indicated to the left of the comment.

5. DO YOU THINK TEACHERS SHOULD COME AND VISIT PARENTS TO TALK ABOUT SCHOOL DURING FUTURE SUMMER SCHOOLS?

"YES":

- or call
- arrange for parents to visit teacher
- so parents can prepare child better for school
- parents should have a conference with the teachers before, during and at the end of summer school.
- to involve parents
10 - so parents know more about school
2 - to discuss progress and goals for student
2 - to give teacher a better orientation to child to help school activities
4 - to get to know the teacher
9 - to find out ways to help child at home
3 - to help the parent understand more about the child's learning
2 - to explain the child's specific problems during the regular school year.
2 - it improves the teacher's understanding of the child's needs for learning
- because many parents can't go to the schools because of smaller children at home
- " to establish rapport and communication about the child"
- because this will help the teacher and parents both
- to improve the child/teacher relationship
- because I learned how to get my daughter to like to read
2 - for the interest of my child
- to learn more about their children's learning habits
2 - to promote mutual cooperation during summer school activities
- so parents and teachers get to know each other
2 - to explain what will be taught
- to inform them about why child is attending summer school
- in the evening
- to find out ways to help the child's teacher so school will be a success
- if they have time
- or parents can see their kids in school
- because some people work late and do not have a way to school
- to find out what our child especially needs more help on
- to answer questions
- "because after school has started the child gets different"

"NO":

- it would be easier for the parents to visit the school
- a phone call would be enough
- I have no time
- I know his weaknesses
- " I think they did very well and the time should be used for preparing lessons."
- this could be discussed at the last parent-teacher conference during the year if the child seems to need summer school
- it's better if the teachers don't have an opinion so they can work with him better
- because school doesn't last that long
- teachers are too busy
- it depends on the needs of the student

DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR IDEAS ABOUT CHANGES FOR FUTURE SUMMER SCHOOLS?

- Six weeks might be more beneficial.
3 - More homework.
- Should be able to take either math or reading but not <u>have</u> to take both!
4 - My child enjoyed summer school and benefited from it.
- "I wish they could have learned to work with computers."
2 - Make sure material is sent out to follow up on letters. I received letters but no materials (workbook,etc.)

ORE NOTE: Workbook was sent home with students on the last day of school for math.

2 - Instruct children more in weakest area (reading for this child).
2 - Use the same teaching technique and small classes throughout the system to assist children who need extra help.
3 - My child enjoyed summer school tremendously.
- Summer school helped my child catch up.
- I feel my child's progress during the regular school year was slowed down at Metz because he was placed in a predominantly Spanish-speaking environment. He was the only white male in his first-grade class. Summer school helped my child catch up.
- My child enjoyed the weekly treats for attending.
- My child liked the time summer school started.
2 - Students should be able to be passed on to the next grade if they attend summer school.
- The teachers showed interest and patience with my child.
- Just hope it will continue for those who need these special classes.
- "I'm not sure if it was the teacher or the different school, but his attitude changed favorably toward school activities and he showed much more interest."
4 - Include other children with less specific problems--not just those "held back". Include any children with special needs--offer more tutorial help.
4 - It was just right.
4 - I think it really works. My child is doing much better in reading and math.
- I think it shows the children that it's not as hard as it seems during regular school.
- My child liked the calculator, but I don't understand why they were used. I thought they were to learn to use math by themselves.
2 - I wish there was always summer school. It's much better than just staying home.
- My child's teacher sent home a letter each week telling me how my son was doing -- he was working hard and having fun.
- Longer hours in school.
- Should include all subjects (English, history, spelling, geography, as well as reading and math).
- "I think bilingual classes are a waste of the child's and parents' time."
- I received some math activities but I didn't know what they were for, but I think it is a good idea to keep the child aware of what has already been done.
- "Yes, my child has a very hard time paying attention to what people are saying. He gets distracted very, very easily. I would like him to get interested in reading, but everything I've tried has failed--I'm in tears about him."
- "I believe I should have received something in the mail telling me how my child did in summer school."
- Keep the parents updated on child's progress and problems.
- Parent/teacher conference.

- Activities for child and parent (or others) to do together.
- Summer school should last all summer.
- Keep the age groups together. My child complained about bigger kids and work being too hard.

2 - The teachers did an excellent job of exciting my child and getting him interested. (He was often bored during the regular school year with classes.) He never missed a day, even when he felt bad.

- Thank you very much!
- Plan summer school dates early and let parents know--my child had to miss 1½ weeks.
- "I'm sure the teachers were good, but my son still can not read. His buddy being in his class did not help any. If I had known more or gone to the school, (it) may have helped."
- The best things were the slower pace, sense of accomplishment, and the calculator incentive to attend every day.
- We moved and found out the bus would no longer pick our son up so he dropped out after a few weeks. The highway is too dangerous to cross.
- More extra work for the rest of the summer.
- Everything was fine except that there should be a bus to pick up the kids because it is hard to take them to school at times.
- There should be more bilingual teachers so that there can be more communication.
- My child was very happy going to summer school even though she had gone to school all year long. She learned numbers and colors. She was very enthusiastic and was always ready for school on time.

82.25

Summer School Pilot Project

Appendix K

TEACHER CHECKLIST

82.25 Instrument Description: Teacher Checklist

Brief description of the instrument:

The teacher checklist rates retainees' reading and math skills and behavior in the classroom. It includes six items related to academic skills and 12 related to behavior. Teachers rated the retainee compared to other students in their fall 1982 classroom.

To whom was the instrument administered?

A total of 300 retainees from 1980-81 and 1981-82--150 who attended summer school and 150 who did not. Equal numbers of 1980-81 and 1981-82 retainees were chosen.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once with one reminder.

When was the instrument administered?

October 1982 (sent out October 20 with reminder November 1).

Where was the instrument administered?

Surveys were sent to the principals of the students' present school for delivery to teachers. Teachers generally completed questionnaires in their classrooms.

Who administered the instrument?

Self-administered.

What training did the administrators have?

None needed--directions on checklist.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

Return rate could be affected by method of delivery but any effect is unknown.

Who developed the instrument?

Office of Research & Evaluation staff with input from elementary administrators.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

This information is not available for the "skills" section. However, the "behavior" section is based on the Behavior Rating Checklist which does have this type of data. Reliability based on Cronbach alpha coefficients of internal consistency is .87 and .94 for the two factors measured. Test-retest reliabilities between October and May were .71 and .70. A validity study showed that the scale can distinguish between students of different types.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

TEACHER CHECKLIST

Purpose

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) requested information on the skills and knowledge of retainees who did and did not attend summer school in the spring of 1982, fall of 1982, and spring of 1983. The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) information was used for the spring 1982 and spring 1983 assessments. The teacher checklist was designed to provide skill information for fall 1982.

Procedure

Sample. Most (61%) of the students served by the 1982 summer school were retainees from 1981-82 or 1980-81. Only 5% of the summer students were 1979-80 retainees, with the remaining 34% of unknown retention status (due to the unavailability of computerized retention records prior to 1979-80).

Based on this information, a decision was made to concentrate on a sample of 1981-82 and 1980-81 retainees who did and did not attend summer school. A total of 75 1980-81 and 75 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school were drawn first. Students who had been retained twice were not selected for the sample. Then a random sample of 75 1980-81 and 75 1981-82 retainees who did not attend summer school were selected. Thus, a total sample of 300 students was chosen. Labels were printed showing each student's name, school, and grade.

Instrument. A draft of the instrument was developed by ORE staff. Key instructional and ORE personnel were asked to review the checklist through a memorandum on September 14 (see Attachment K-1). Comments led to changes in Item 1b under "Skills" and Items 11 and 12 under "Behavior." The final instrument is shown in Attachment K-2.

The final instrument was named the "Retainee Checklist." It includes six items concerning the students' reading and math skills. The reading and math skills are based on skills taught in the summer school plus Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). Math computation (Item 5) was actually not emphasized during summer school but may have been affected indirectly through math instruction in math concepts and problem solving. Item 6 provided information relevant to the overall retention evaluation for 1981-83.

The teacher checklist also includes 12 items concerning classroom behavior. The first 10 are actually the Behavior Rating Checklist (BRC) developed by ORE staff in 1976-77 and factor analyzed and checked for reliability and validity in 1977-78 and 1978-79 (see ORE Publication No. 78.78 for complete

information). The scale taps two areas of classroom behavior--Ready, Willing, and Able (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10) and Disruptive Classroom Behavior (Items 4, 6, 7). Cronbach alpha coefficients of internal consistency indicated reliabilities of .87 for the Ready, Willing, and Able scale and .94 for the Disruptive Classroom Behavior (DCB) scale. Pearson correlations of preratings (October) and postratings (April) indicated test-retest reliability coefficients of .71 and .70 for the RWA and DCB scales, respectively. A validity study showed that groups of students expected to differ on the two scales based on counselor prediction actually were rated differently by classroom teachers. The availability of this type of data on the BRC made it a valuable way to gain a rating of retainees' classroom behavior.

The last two items (11 and 12) are not part of the BRC. They deal with areas of particular interest for retainee populations, and were added based on comments to the draft by the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Instruction.

Distribution. A memorandum was sent to the principals (Attachment K-3) along with copies of the checklist to distribute to randomly selected students' teachers. Almost all elementary schools received at least one survey. It was not possible to send the checklists directly to the teachers because teacher codes had not been added to the Student Master File by October.

Surveys were sent out via school mail on October 20 and were checked in as received. A reminder was sent on November 1.

Analyses. Surveys were accepted through November 9. They were then taken for keypunching and verification to the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. The data file format is shown in Attachment K-4. Once returned, frequencies of responses for each item were calculated using the AISD IBM computer. These statistics were done for all retainees, retainees who attended summer school, and retainees who did not attend summer school. Mean ratings on the RWA (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10) and DCB (Items 4, 6, 7) scales were then calculated for those attending and not attending summer school. Scores for Items 1 and 3 were reversed on the RWA scale. Most students had ratings available for all items on each scale. However, the average scores for students who were missing a rating were still used and simply calculated on the basis of the number of ratings given.

Results

A total of 269 of the 300 surveys (89.7%) were returned and usable. A few other surveys were returned blank because the student had left the District or the school—these were not used. Responses to each item for the overall group, the 1980-81 and 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school, and the 1980-81 and 1981-82 retainees who did not attend summer school are shown in Attachment K-5.

Skills

Reading. The survey asked teachers to rate students' reading comprehension and vocabulary skills compared to other students in their fall class. Figure K-1 shows the responses of the four retainee groups and the total group to each reading item. All ratings of 9, 8, and 7 were collapsed into the category "low"; all 6, 5, and 4 ratings were called "average"; and all 3, 2, and 1 ratings were called "high." A typographical error was made on item 1d, "Understanding Cause and Effect"--this item should have been rated for 3rd- and 4th-grade students but was listed to be rated for 4th and 5th-grade students. This error meant few third graders were rated on this item.

Some differences in trends were evident between retainees who attended summer school and those who did not.

- Overall, 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school were rated "low" less often than those who did not (in six of eight cases or 75% of the time). They were also rated "average" more often (in six of eight cases).

- This was not true for 1980-81 retainees. Those who attended summer school were rated low more often than those who did not in four of seven cases (57.1%). They were also rated high less often (in six of seven cases).

The 1981-82 summer school retainees were rated low less often than retainees not attending summer school in terms of reading comprehension, understanding facts, making inferences (grade two and six), and vocabulary. They were rated low more often in the areas of making inferences at grade 5 and understanding cause and effect at grade four. The 1980-81 retainees who attended summer school were only rated low less often in terms of making inferences (grades 2, 5, and 6).

As might be expected, retainees were rated low on skills more often than high. The only instance in which this was not true was "How and Why" at grade one. This makes some sense since most first graders have had little prior reading experience and ratings were done in October.

In the math skill areas, trends were similar (see Figure K-2).

- The 1980-81 retainees who attended summer school were more likely to be rated low than those who did not attend. However, they were also more likely to be rated high (and less likely to be rated average).

- The 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school were less likely to be rated low, more likely to be rated average, and about equally likely to be rated high than those who did not go to summer school.

- Retainees were more likely to be rated low than high on math skills (except for 1981-82 retainees in math computation).

It was originally anticipated that the smallest difference between groups would be seen in math computation since this was not emphasized in summer school. This did not appear to be the case.

These results seem to suggest that the 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school benefitted from the experience more than the 1980-81 retainees who attended. This could be possible, since a number of summer school teachers noted in the teacher surveys that the 1980-81 retainees were more difficult to place in the materials. However, interpretations must be made with caution. It is not known whether the retainees from 1980-81 and 1981-82 who attended summer school were somehow different than those who did not attend and whether this difference was constant for both groups of retainees. It could be, for example, that the parents of 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school were more highly motivated to help their children than those who did not send their children while this was not true for the 1980-81 retainees. Caution is also necessary because teachers' perceptions of "average" could vary to some unknown extent.

			LOW (9,8,7)	AVERAGE (6,5,4)	HIGH (3,2,1)
1. READING COMPREHENSION					
Overall		N = 207	25.6	63.8	10.6
Summer School	80-81	N = 52	40.3	53.8	5.8
Summer School	81-82	N = 55	9.0	78.3	12.7
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 50	34.0	56.0	10.0
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 50	20.0	66.0	14.0
A. UNDERSTANDING FACTS					
Overall		N = 162	23.4	61.7	14.8
Summer School	80-81	N = 36	39.0	58.3	2.8
Summer School	81-82	N = 48	12.6	75.0	12.5
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 35	20.0	65.7	14.3
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 43	25.7	46.6	28.0
B. GRADE 1 How and Why					
Overall		N = 41	7.3	68.3	24.4
Summer School	80-81	N = 0	-	-	-
Summer School	81-82	N = 20	5.0	70.0	25.0
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 0	-	-	-
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 21	9.6	66.6	23.8
C. MAKING INFERENCES					
GRADE 2: Overall		N = 63	34.9	52.4	12.7
Summer School	80-81	N = 17	47.1	47.0	5.9
Summer School	81-82	N = 16	12.5	75.1	12.6
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 18	55.5	27.8	16.7
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 12	16.6	66.7	16.6
GRADE 5: Overall		N = 26	19.2	73.0	7.7
Summer School	80-81	N = 5	20.0	80.0	0
Summer School	81-82	N = 7	14.3	85.8	0
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 5	40.0	40.0	20.0
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 9	11.1	77.7	11.1
GRADE 6: Overall		N = 14	42.8	57.1	0
Summer School	80-81	N = 6	33.3	66.6	0
Summer School	80-81	N = 2	50.0	50.0	0
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 5	40.0	60.0	0
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 1	100.0	0	0
D. UNDERSTANDING CAUSE AND EFFECT					
GRADE 3: Overall		N = 4	25.0	75.0	0
Summer School	80-81	N = 3	33.0	66.7	0
Summer School	80-81	N = 0	-	-	-
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 1	0	100.0	0
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 0	-	-	-
GRADE 4: Overall		N = 38	36.8	55.3	7.9
Summer School	80-81	N = 7	42.9	57.2	0
Summer School	81-82	N = 11	45.5	45.5	9.1
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 9	22.2	66.6	11.1
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 11	36.4	54.6	9.1

			LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH
2. VOCABULARY					
Overall		N = 262	25.6	63.7	10.7
Summer School	80-81	N = 64	36.0	59.4	4.7
Summer School	81-82	N = 70	17.1	64.2	18.5
Non-Summer School	80-81	N = 63	30.1	61.9	8.0
Non-Summer School	81-82	N = 65	20.0	69.2	10.8

Figure K-1. RATINGS OF READING SKILLS OF RETAINEES ATTENDING AND NOT ATTENDING SUMMER SCHOOL. Chart shows percentages of each group rated high, average, and low. All ratings of 9, 8, 7 were called "low," all ratings of 6, 5, 4 were called "average," all ratings of 3, 2, 1 were called "high." Complete ratings can be found in Attachment K-5.

3. MATH CONCEPTS		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH
Overall	N = 259	20.4	61.7	17.7
Summer School 80-81	N = 63	28.6	55.5	15.9
Summer School 81-82	N = 70	12.9	67.1	19.9
Non-Summer School 80-81	N = 62	19.3	69.4	11.3
Non-Summer School 81-82	N = 64	21.8	54.7	23.5

4. MATH PROBLEM SOLVING		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH
Overall	N = 258	28.7	58.2	13.2
Summer School 80-81	N = 63	38.1	53.9	8.0
Summer School 81-82	N = 69	21.7	59.3	18.8
Non-Summer School 80-81	N = 62	26.9	66.7	6.3
Non-Summer School 81-82	N = 63	28.6	52.3	18.9

5. MATH COMPUTATION		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH
Overall	N = 260	21.2	58.1	20.7
Summer School 80-81	N = 63	27.0	61.9	11.2
Summer School 81-82	N = 70	12.9	57.2	30.1
Non-Summer School 80-81	N = 62	22.2	61.9	15.9
Non-Summer School 81-82	N = 64	23.5	51.6	25.0

Figure K-2. PERCENTAGE OF RETAINEES ATTENDING AND NOT ATTENDING SUMMER SCHOOL RATED HIGH, AVERAGE, AND LOW IN MATH SKILLS. Ratings of 9, 8, 7 equal "low," 6, 5, 4 equal "average," and 3, 2, 1 equal "high." Complete ratings are shown in Attachment K-5.

Skill Strengths and Weaknesses Sheets

In 1981-82, AISD started to require a skill "Strengths and Weaknesses" sheet to be filled in by the 1981-82 teacher retainee. Item 6 on the survey asked teachers whether they had received this for the retainee in question and whether it was helpful in determining needs and strengths. Of the 138 teachers of 1981-82 retainees surveyed, 105 (76%) said they had received this sheet and 33 (24%) said they had not. Teachers with retainees who attended summer school were somewhat more likely to say they had received the sheets.

Of the 102 teachers who responded to the question regarding the usefulness of the sheet, 34 (33.3%) said it helped a lot, 56 (54.9%) said it helped a little, and 12 (11.8%) said it did not help.

Behavior

Each groups's ratings of the frequency of various calssroom behaviors is shown in Attachment K-5. The behaviors most often rated as occurring fairly frequently (ratings of 7, 8, and 9) were:

2) Student understands and follows directions. (49%)

8) Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay. (56%)

9) Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc. (47%)

10) Student completes work on time and in good order. (49%)

The only behavior most often rated as occurring occasionally (ratings of 4, 5, and 6) was:

1) Student demands extra time from the teacher for help. (41%)

The rest of the behaviors were most often rated as never having occurred or occurring very infrequently (ratings of 1, 2, and 3). These include:

3) Student quits or gives up on assignments. (54%)

4) Student bothers others while they are working. (47%)

5) Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination. (47%)

6) Student breaks classroom or school rules. (40%)

7) Student must be reprimanded during class time. (46%)

11) Student complains that other students tease him/her. (69%)

12) Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities. (40%)

Thus, the retainees in general were described as understanding directions, following through on assignments, and participating in class activities. Although they occasionally demand extra help from the teacher, they seldom give up on assignments, break classroom or school rules, need reprimands during class, or bother others while they are working. On the other hand, retainees do not provide frequently leadership voluntarily, initiate discussions, bring things to class, or show a lot of imagination.

Differences in ratings between retainees who did and did not attend summer school will be discussed in terms of mean ratings on the Ready, Willing, and Able (RWA) scale (Items 1 (Reversed), 2, 3 (Reversed), 5, 8, 9, 10) and the Disruptive Behavior Scale (Items 4, 6, 7). Items 11 and 12, which are not part of the Behavior Rating Checklist, will be discussed separately.

Mean ratings on the Ready, Willing, and Able (RWA) scale were as follows:

GROUP	MEAN	N
Summer School (SS) 80-81	5.4	66
Summer School 81-82	6.0	72
Non-Summer School 80-81	5.4	66
Non-Summer School 81-82	5.9	66

These results show an interesting pattern. Both groups of 1981-82 retainees were seen as slightly more ready, willing, and able to participate in classroom activities than the 1980-81 retainees. No systematic difference was evident between those who did and did not attend summer school, however.

Mean ratings on the Disruptive Classroom Behavior(DCB) scale were:

GROUP	MEAN	N
Summer School (SS) 80-81	4.2	66
Summer School 81-82	4.6	72
Non-Summer School 80-81	4.5	65
Non-Summer School 81-82	3.9	66

These results show unexpected patterns. The 1980-81 retainees who attended summer school were slightly less disruptive than those who did not. On the other hand, the 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school were seen as slightly more disruptive than those who did not. Overall, however, these differences may be too small to have a significant impact in the classroom.

Responses to Items 11 and 12 are shown below for all retainee groups.

ITEM	GROUP	BEHAVIOR OCCURS: INFREQUENTLY	OCCASIONALLY	FREQUENTLY
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her.	Summer School (SS) 80-81	73	17	10
	Summer School 81-82	68	25	7
	Non-SS 80-81	54	37	9
	Non-SS 81-82	79	13	8
	Overall	69	23	8
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities.	Summer School (SS) 80-81	51	25	25
	Summer School 81-82	27	46	28
	Non-SS 80-81	49	36	15
	Non-SS 81-82	36	30	33
	Overall	41	34	26

Little difference can be seen between the average frequency ratings of these behaviors for the retainees who attended summer school and those who did not. However, some differences do exist if the results are examined by year of retention.

Among 1980-81 retainees, those who attended summer school seem to complain of teasing less frequently. On the other hand, 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school seem more likely to complain occasionally about teasing than those who did not attend. Overall, only about 8% of the students complained of frequent teasing from other children according to the teachers.

The 1980-81 retainees who attended summer school were more likely to provide leadership in the classroom frequently than those who did not attend. Among 1981-82 retainees, those who attended summer school were more likely than the rest to provide leadership occasionally. Overall, about one-quarter of the retainees displayed leadership frequently, with one-third displaying such behavior occasionally, and slightly less than half doing so infrequently. The only group for whom the most frequent response was "occasionally" rather than "infrequently" was the 1981-82 summer school attendees.

Summary

- The 1981-82 retainees who attended summer school seemed to have somewhat better reading and math skills than the retainees who did not go to summer school. Those who did and did not attend summer school were rated about the same in terms of being ready, willing, and able to handle classroom activities. Both groups were seen as slightly better prepared than the 1980-81 retainees. The 1981-82 retainees who went to summer school were seen as slightly more disruptive than those who did not.

- The 1980-81 retainees who attended summer school were rated slightly lower than those who did not attend in reading and math skills. Both groups were seen as slightly less ready, willing, and able to handle classroom activities than the 1981-82 retainees. The 1980-81 retainees who attended summer school were slightly less disruptive in the classroom than those who did not.

Thus, 1980-81 and 1981-82 retainees seem to differ in terms of how they were affected by summer school.

82.25

Attachment K-1
(Page 1 of 3)

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

September 14, 1982

TO: Persons Addressed

FROM: Nancy Baenen

SUBJECT: Retainee Checklist

Please review the attached checklist. We would like to send this to the teachers of about 100 retainees who attended summer school and 100 who did not in October. We hope it will reveal some differences in the skills and behavior of the two groups of students. TEA requires some fall assessment of skills as part of the grant. We hope to use the behavior ratings to give us a better idea of the way retainees are functioning in the classroom. It may also help to distinguish those retainees who improve and do not improve after retention once we have test scores on the students next spring.

The skills section can be changed in any way you think is appropriate. The behavior section is actually the "Behavior Rating Checklist" developed by our office several years ago. Since reliability and validity data is available on it, we'd rather not change it unless absolutely necessary.

Let me know what you think by September 28 if at all possible. Thanks!

NB:rrf
Attachment

Approved: _____
Director, Office of Research and Evaluation

Persons Addressed: Ruth MacAllister
Hermelinda Rodriguez
Timy Baranoff
Lucy Sahraie
Anita Uphaus
Glynn Ligon
John MacDonald

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

RETAINEE CHECKLIST

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low			Average					Extremely High
1. Reading comprehension	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Understanding facts (literal meaning)	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. Making generalizations and inferences	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. Vocabulary	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. Math concepts	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. Math problem solving	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. Math computation	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

6. Did you receive a skill strengths and weaknesses sheet on this retainee filled out by the 1981-82 teacher? (check one) ___ Yes ___ No

If so, did you find it useful in determining this child's needs and strengths this fall? (check one)
___ Yes, a lot
___ Yes, a little
___ No

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

		There has been no evidence of this behavior ▼				This behavior occurs occasionally ▼				This behavior is frequent and typical ▼
1.	Student demands extra time from the teacher for help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.	Student understands and follows directions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3.	Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4.	Student bothers others while they are working.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6.	Student breaks classroom or school rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7.	Student must be reprimanded during class time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8.	Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9.	Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10.	Student completes work on time and in good order.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Thank you very much! Return this form as soon as possible to:

Nancy Baenen
Adm. Bldg., Box 79

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

RETAINEE CHECKLIST

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

Your Name: _____

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low				Average				Extremely High
1. Reading comprehension	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Understanding facts (literal meaning)	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. GRADE 1 ONLY: Understanding "How and Why"	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
c. GRADES 2, 5, AND 6 ONLY: Making inferences	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
d. GRADES 4 AND 5 ONLY: Understanding Cause & Effect	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. Vocabulary	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. Math concepts	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. Math problem solving	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. Math computation	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Check the appropriate answer:

6. Did you receive a skill strengths and weaknesses sheet on this retainee filled out by the 1981-82 teacher? ___YES ___NO

If so, did you find it useful in determining this child's needs and strengths this fall?
___YES, a lot
___YES, a little
___NO

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

	There has been no evidence of this behavior ◆				This behavior occurs occasionally ◆				This behavior is frequent and typical ◆
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Student understands and follows directions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Student bothers others while they are working.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

	There has been no evidence of this behavior				This behavior occurs occasionally				This behavior is frequent and typical
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. Student completes work on time and in good order.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Thank you! Please fold this form so the return address shows and put in the school mail as soon as possible.

MAIL TO:

NANCY B. SCHULYER
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
ORE, BOX 79

Attachment K-3

82.25

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

October 18, 1982

TO: Elementary Principals

FROM: Nancy Boenen Schuyler

SUBJECT: Retention Checklist

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) provided over $80,000 for the 1982 summer school for retainees. The Agency would like to identify model programs that are effective in improving student performance. One type of information they have requested is a fall assessment of the skills of retainees who did and did not attend summer school.

Since we did not want to spend teacher and student time on testing, we developed a short questionnaire for a sample of teachers to complete rating the retainees' skills and behavior compared to others in their classroom this fall. Average ratings for retainees who did and did not attend summer school will then be compared. Scores on the ITBS for 1981-82 and 1982-83 will be compared next spring after the regular testing.

We need your help in delivering these questionnaires to the randomly selected teachers since the teacher codes for students have not yet been entered on the Student Master File. Please place the enclosed labeled questionnaires in the appropriate teachers' mail boxes.

Thank you very much for your help.

NB:rrf
Enclosures

Approved: _____
Director, Office of Research and Evaluation

Approved: _____
Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education

FILE ID ATTIK — CARD FILE LAYOUT — LOCATION: — Page ____ of ____

PROGRAM: RETENTION 1982-83 — ✓ AISD ____

YEAR: 1982-83 — UT PF ____, ____, ____

CONTENTS: RETAINICE CHECKLIST → SURVEY SENT TO 300 TEACHERS acct. pass. file name OF 1980-81 & 1981-82 RETAINEES WHO DID & DID NOT ATEND SUMMER SCHOOL.

Field	Columns	Description
A	1-3	FILE ID → ATK (SAME ON ALL CARDS)
B	4-15	STUDENT'S LAST NAME (LEFT JUSTIFIED)
C	16-18	SEQUENCE NUMBER. (ADD A LEADING 0 FOR ANY NUMBERS THAT ARE 2 DIGITS)
D	19-21	BLANK
E	22	GRADE
F	23	BLANK
G	24-32	RESPONSES TO 1, 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 2, 3, 4, & 5 → UNDER "SKILLS" CODE WITH NUMBER CIRCLED (1-4) BLANK = BLANK (IF 2 #'S ARE CODED, COUNT MOST EXTREME NUMBER. (1 AND 2 = 1, 3 AND 4 = 4 FOR EXAMPLE)
H	33-34	RESPONSES TO 2 PARTS OF QUESTION 6. PART 1 (1, 2, BLANK) PART 2 (1, 2, 3, OR BLANK)
I	35-46	RESPONSES TO ITEMS 1-12 UNDER "BEHAVIOR." (1-4 AS CIRCLED OR BLANK IF BLANK). IF 2 #'S ARE CIRCLED, CODE HIGHEST NUMBER (4 & 5 = 5)

82.25

K-18

Attachment K-4

Attachment K-5
(Page 1 of 10)

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

Overall Responses

RETAINEE CHECKLIST

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

Your Name: _____

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low				Average				Extremely High	
1. Reading comprehension N=267	4% 3.9 9	5.3 8	14.4 7	15.5 6	34.3 5	14.0 4	5.2 3	1.9 2	1.9 1	
a. Understanding facts (literal meaning) N=162	4.9 9	3.7 8	14.2 7	14.2 6	35.4 5	14.1 4	5.7 3	2.5 2	1.2 1	
b. GRADE 1 ONLY: N=41 Understanding "How and Why"	0.0	2.4	4.9	14.6	39.5	22.0	9.8	4.9	2.0	
c. GRADES 2, 5, AND 6 ONLY: Making inferences	4.5 3.6 0.0	7.9 6.4 7.1	23.3 16.9 35.7	14.3 20.3 28.6	20.2 24.1 21.4	12.7 3.8 3.6	4.5 2.5 0.0	3.2 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	Grade 2 N=63 Grade 5 N=36 Grade 6 N=14
d. GRADES 4 AND 5 ONLY: Understanding Cause & Effect	0.0 10.5	0.0 2.6	28.0 23.7	0.0 34.6	72.0 13.2	0.0 5.3	0.0 5.3	0.0 2.6	0.0 0.0	Grade 3 N=9 Grade 4 N=38
2. Vocabulary N=262	3.1 9	5.0 8	15.3 7	13.3 6	31.3 5	14.1 4	8.0 3	1.9 2	0.8 1	
3. Math concepts N=259	1.5 9	4.6 8	7.0 7	14.9 6	23.5 5	13.5 4	13.6 3	4.7 2	1.5 1	
4. Math problem solving N=258	3.9 9	9.3 8	13.5 7	20.2 6	23.1 5	14.7 4	5.8 3	3.1 2	2.3 1	
5. Math computation N=260	0.8 9	5.4 8	15.0 7	15.4 6	28.5 5	15.0 4	11.9 3	4.5 2	2.3 1	

Check the appropriate answer:

6. Did you receive a skill strengths and weaknesses sheet on this retainee filled out by the 1981-82 teacher? N=260
58.1 YES 41.9 NO

If so, did you find it useful in determining this child's needs and strengths this fall? N=197
30.6 YES, a lot
59.9 YES, a little
9.5 NO

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

	There has been no evidence of this behavior				This behavior occurs occasionally				This behavior is frequent and typical
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help. N=269	14.1 1	7.1 2	10.4 3	8.6 4	26.8 5	5.6 6	9.7 7	8.7 8	9.3 9
2. Student understands and follows directions. N=264	1.9 1	2.2 2	9.0 3	9.3 4	18.7 5	9.7 6	20.5 7	14.3 8	7.5 9
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion. N=269	30.5 1	12.3 2	10.8 3	5.6 4	14.0 5	4.8 6	7.4 7	6.7 8	5.9 9
4. Student bothers others while they are working. N=269	22.3 1	14.9 2	11.2 3	7.4 4	16.4 5	5.2 6	5.9 7	10.4 8	7.4 9
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination. N=267	20.6 1	13.9 2	12.7 3	7.9 4	22.5 5	4.5 6	3.2 7	5.2 8	4.5 9
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules. N=265	14.9 1	13.5 2	9.7 3	9.2 4	18.7 5	5.4 6	12.3 7	6.3 8	8.6 9
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time. N=266	13.0 1	14.4 2	12.4 3	12.8 4	10.4 5	4.1 6	13.7 7	7.5 8	8.6 9

		There has been no evidence of this behavior				This behavior occurs occasionally			This behavior is frequent and typical	
8.	Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay. N=258	4.0 1	4.3 2	4.3 3	4.8 4	13.2 5	4.9 6	17.9 7	20.9 8	16.8 9
9.	Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc. N=251	3.6 1	4.4 2	4.4 3	8.4 4	14.7 5	11.2 6	17.1 7	19.5 8	10.8 9
10.	Student completes work on time and in good order. N=251	3.6 1	3.6 2	3.6 3	10.4 4	12.0 5	10.0 6	18.7 7	16.3 8	14.3 9
11.	Student complains that other students tease him/her. N=259	34.4 1	20.0 2	9.3 3	4.3 4	14.9 5	3.4 6	1.6 7	4.0 8	2.8 9
12.	Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities. N=251	15.9 1	13.5 2	10.3 3	9.2 4	12.9 5	7.2 6	9.6 7	11.6 8	4.4 9

Thank you! Please fold this form so the return address shows and put in the school mail as soon as possible.

MAIL TO:

NANCY B. SCHULYER
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
ORE, BOX 79

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

1980-81 Summer School

RETAINEE CHECKLIST

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

Your Name: _____

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low				Average			Extremely High	
1. Reading comprehension N=52	% 3.8	9.6	26.9	11.5	34.6	7.7	5.8	0.0	0.0
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
a. Understanding facts N=34 (literal meaning)	2.9	5.9	38.2	17.6	32.4	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
b. GRADE 1 ONLY: N=0 Understanding "How and Why"	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
c. GRADES 2, 5, AND 6 ONLY:	5.9	11.8	29.4	23.5	17.6	5.9	5.9	0.0	0.0
Making inferences	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
d. GRADES 4 AND 5 ONLY:	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	44.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Understanding Cause & Effect	14.3	0.0	28.6	21.4	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Vocabulary N=64	4.7	9.4	26.9	17.2	32.8	9.4	4.7	0.0	0.0
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. Math concepts N=63	1.6	12.7	14.3	23.8	23.8	7.9	12.7	3.2	0.0
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. Math problem solving N=63	3.2	7.9	28.6	17.5	23.8	4.8	3.2	3.2	1.6
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. Math computation N=63	3.2	6.3	23.5	19.0	27.0	15.9	4.8	4.8	1.6
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Check the appropriate answer:

6. Did you receive a skill strengths and weaknesses sheet on this retainee filled out by the 1981-82 teacher? N=65
   53.8 YES 46.2 NO

   If so, did you find it useful in determining this child's needs and strengths this fall? N=34
   23.5 YES, a lot
   70.6 YES, a little
   5.9 NO

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

	There has been no evidence of this behavior ◄				This behavior occurs occasionally			This behavior is frequent and typical ►	
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help. N=66	12.1	7.6	12.1	7.6	18.2	10.6	7.6	12.6	10.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Student understands and follows directions. N=65	1.5	4.6	12.3	9.2	20.0	13.8	23.1	15.4	3.1
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion. N=66	25.8	4.1	13.6	4.6	16.7	3.0	9.1	7.6	7.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Student bothers others while they are working. N=66	24.2	16.7	12.1	1.5	16.7	3.0	4.5	10.6	10.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination. N=66	22.7	12.1	19.7	6.1	22.7	1.5	6.1	4.5	4.5
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules. N=66	16.7	15.2	9.1	7.6	18.2	7.6	4.5	7.6	10.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time. N=66	22.7	16.7	9.1	7.6	13.6	7.6	6.1	6.1	10.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

	There has been no evidence of this behavior ◄				This behavior occurs occasionally				This behavior is frequent and typical ►
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay. N=61	6.6 1	3.3 2	9.8 3	3.3 4	14.8 5	4.9 6	13.1 7	23.0 8	29.6 9
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc. N=61	4.9 1	6.6 2	13.1 3	6.6 4	13.1 5	13.1 6	21.3 7	14.9 8	4.9 9
10. Student completes work on time and in good order. N=61	3.3 1	14.8 2	6.6 3	9.8 4	9.8 5	9.2 6	23.0 7	14.8 8	9.8 9
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her. N=60	48.0 1	20.0 2	3.3 3	3.3 4	6.7 5	6.7 6	5.0 7	3.3 8	1.7 9
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities. N=61	15.0 1	14.4 2	14.8 3	9.8 4	13.1 5	1.6 6	9.8 7	9.8 8	4.9 9

Thank you! Please fold this form so the return address shows and put in the school mail as soon as possible.

MAIL TO:

NANCY B. SCHULYER
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
ORE, BOX 79

82.25

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

1981-82 Summer School

RETAINEE CHECKLIST

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

Your Name: _____

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low				Average				Extremely High	
1. Reading comprehension N=55	% 3.6	3.6	1.8	5.4	27.5	16.4	10.9	0.0	1.8	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
a. Understanding facts (literal meaning) N=48	4.3	2.8	4.2	20.8	35.4	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
b. GRADE 1 ONLY: Understanding "How and Why" N=20	0.0	0.0	5.0	20.0	35.0	15.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	
c. GRADES 2, 5, AND 6 ONLY: Making inferences	0.0	0.0	12.5	6.3	37.5	31.3	6.3	6.3	0.0	N=16 Grade 2
	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N=7 Grade 5
	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N=2 Grade 6
d. GRADES 4 AND 5 ONLY: Understanding Cause & Effect	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N=0 Grade 3
	18.2	9.1	18.2	36.4	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	N=11 Grade 4
	4.3	5.7	7.1	15.7	31.4	17.1	15.7	1.4	1.4	
2. Vocabulary N=70	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
3. Math concepts N=70	0.0	4.3	8.6	18.3	31.4	21.4	11.4	2.1	1.4	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
4. Math problem solving N=49	1.4	5.8	14.3	15.9	30.4	13.0	2.0	2.1	0.0	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
5. Math computation N=70	0.0	4.3	8.6	12.9	25.7	18.6	14.3	12.9	2.9	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

Check the appropriate answer:

6. Did you receive a skill strengths and weaknesses sheet on this retainee filled out by the 1981-82 teacher?? N=32
   87.5 YES 12.5 NO

   If so, did you find it useful in determining this child's needs and strengths this fall? N=62
   29.0 YES, a lot
   54.5 YES, a little
   16.5 NO

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

	There has been no evidence of this behavior ◀				This behavior occurs occasionally				This behavior is frequent and typical ▶
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help. N=72	18.1	8.3	9.7	12.5	22.2	2.8	6.9	6.9	6.9
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Student understands and follows directions. N=72	0.0	1.4	6.9	11.1	15.3	6.9	20.8	26.4	11.1
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion. N=72	31.9	20.8	12.5	2.8	13.9	5.6	5.6	4.2	2.8
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Student bothers others while they are working. N=72	22.2	13.9	6.9	9.7	20.8	1.4	5.6	12.9	5.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination. N=71	15.5	9.9	7.0	8.5	22.5	2.8	12.3	8.5	7.0
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules. N=72	11.1	9.7	4.2	12.5	26.4	2.8	13.9	8.3	5.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time. N=72	15.3	9.7	11.1	12.5	12.5	1.4	13.9	11.1	5.6
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

	There has been no evidence of this behavior.				This behavior occurs occasionally			This behavior is frequent and typical	
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay. N=67	3.0	4.5	9.0	7.5	19.4	9.0	20.9	19.4	7.5
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc. N=67	3.0	3.0	4.5	9.0	20.9	6.0	17.9	25.4	13.4
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. Student completes work on time and in good order. N=68	1.5	4.4	5.9	13.2	9.5	5.5	19.1	23.5	16.2
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her. N=68	38.7	22.1	5.9	9.4	17.6	2.9	0.0	5.9	1.5
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities. N=66	11.5	9.5	6.9	11.9	22.1	11.5	11.5	13.2	2.9
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Thank you! Please fold this form so the return address shows and put in the school mail as soon as possible.

MAIL TO:

NANCY B. SCHULYER
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
ORE, BOX 79

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

1980-81 Non Summer School

RETAINEE CHECKLIST

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

Your Name: _____

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low				Average				Extremely High	
1. Reading comprehension N=50	4.0	6.0	24.0	22.0	22.0	12.0	4.0	6.0	0.0	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
a. Understanding facts N=35 (literal meaning)	5.7	8.6	17.1	11.4	40.0	11.4	5.7	5.7	0.0	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
b. GRADE 1 ONLY: N=0 Understanding "How and Why"	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
c. GRADES 2, 5, AND 6 ONLY: Making inferences	11.1	11.1	33.3	11.1	11.1	5.6	16.7	0.0	0.0	Grade 2 N=18
	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	Grade 5 N=5
	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Grade 6 N=5
d. GRADES 4 AND 5 ONLY: Understanding Cause & Effect	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	Grade 3 N=1
	0.0	0.0	22.2	44.4	11.1	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.0	Grade 4 N=9
2. Vocabulary N=63	1.6	9.5	19.0	23.8	23.8	14.3	4.8	3.2	0.0	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
3. Math concepts N=62	1.6	3.2	14.5	19.4	38.7	14.5	4.8	3.2	0.0	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
4. Math problem solving N=63	4.8	1.6	14.0	25.4	36.5	11.1	4.8	0.0	0.0	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
5. Math computation N=63	0.0	4.8	15.9	17.5	34.9	9.5	12.7	3.2	0.0	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

Check the appropriate answer:

6. Did you receive a skill strengths and weaknesses sheet on this retainee filled out by the 1981-82 teacher? N=57
   19.3 YES 80.7 NO

   If so, did you find it useful in determining this child's needs and strengths this fall? N=11
   27.3 YES, a lot
   72.7 YES, a little
   0.0 NO

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

	There has been no evidence of this behavior			This behavior occurs occasionally				This behavior is frequent and typical	
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help. N=65	3.1	7.7	7.7	6.2	32.3	7.7	13.5	6.2	10.8
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Student understands and follows directions. N=65	1.5	1.5	12.3	12.3	23.1	12.3	15.4	15.4	6.2
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion. N=65	20.0	10.8	7.7	10.8	21.5	4.6	7.7	10.8	6.2
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Student bothers others while they are working. N=65	13.5	13.5	10.8	7.7	9.2	9.2	7.7	9.2	9.2
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination. N=65	20.0	21.5	15.4	9.2	16.9	6.2	1.5	3.1	6.2
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules. N=65	15.4	16.9	9.2	3.1	13.8	9.2	13.8	4.6	12.3
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time. N=65	16.5	21.5	3.1	12.3	9.2	3.1	10.8	9.2	12.3
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

	There has been no evidence of this behavior ◄				This behavior occurs occasionally			This behavior is frequent and typical ►	
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay. N=59	6.8 1	10.2 2	3.4 3	8.5 4	13.6 5	5.1 6	22.0 7	15.3 8	15.3 9
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc. N=60	1.7 1	11.7 2	6.7 3	8.3 4	21.7 5	10.3 6	11.7 7	13.3 8	6.7 9
10. Student completes work on time and in good order. N=60	6.7 1	8.3 2	11.7 3	10.0 4	11.7 5	11.7 6	20.0 7	10.0 8	10.0 9
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her. N=59	32.5 1	16.9 2	6.8 3	10.2 4	23.7 5	3.4 6	1.7 7	3.4 8	3.4 9
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities. N=59	15.3 1	20.3 2	13.6 3	10.2 4	16.9 5	8.5 6	8.5 7	5.1 8	1.7 9

Thank you! Please fold this form so the return address shows and put in the school mail as soon as possible.

MAIL TO:

NANCY B. SCHULTZ
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
ORE, BOX 79

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

1981-82 Non Summer School

RETAINEE CHECKLIST

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

Your Name: _____

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low				Average				Extremely High	
1. Reading comprehension N=50	% 4.0 9	2.0 8	14.0 7	12.0 6	34.0 5	22.0 4	12.0 3	4.0 2	2.0 1	
a. Understanding facts N=43 (literal meaning)	2.3 9	4.7 8	4.7 7	9.3 6	32.9 5	25.6 4	12.3 3	7.0 2	2.3 1	
b. GRADE 1 ONLY: N=21 Understanding "How and Why"	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	42.9	9.5	14.3	4.8	0.0	
c. GRADES 2, 5, AND 6 ONLY: Making inferences	0.0 14.1	4.5 0.0	4.5 0.0	14.7 42.9	25.0 28.2	25.0 14.1	4.5 14.1	4.5 0.0	0.0 0.0	Grade 2 N=12 Grade 5 N=7 Grade 6 N=1
d. GRADES 4 AND 5 ONLY: Understanding Cause & Effect	0.0 9.1	100.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	Grade 3 N=0 Grade 4 N=11
2. Vocabulary N=65	1.5 9	7.7 8	18.5 7	16.9 6	36.9 5	15.4 4	4.2 3	3.1 2	1.5 1	
3. Math concepts N=64	3.1 9	7.8 8	18.9 7	15.6 6	28.1 5	12.5 4	12.5 3	6.2 2	4.7 1	
4. Math problem solving N=63	4.8 9	14.3 8	7.9 7	22.2 6	23.8 5	9.5 4	12.7 3	3.2 2	1.6 1	
5. Math computation N=64	0.0 9	4.7 8	15.6 7	12.5 6	34.4 5	12.5 4	15.6 3	4.7 2	4.7 1	

Check the appropriate answer:

6. Did you receive a skill strengths and weaknesses sheet on this retainee filled out by the 1981-82 teacher? N=66
63.6 YES 36.4 NO

If so, did you find it useful in determining this child's needs and strengths this fall? N=40
40.0 YES, a lot
52.5 YES, a little
7.5 NO

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

	There has been no evidence of this behavior ◄				This behavior occurs occasionally ◄►				This behavior is frequent and typical ►	
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help. N=66	22.7 1	4.5 2	12.1 3	7.6 4	28.8 5	1.5 6	6.1 7	12.1 8	4.5 9	
2. Student understands and follows directions. N=66	4.5 1	1.5 2	4.5 3	6.1 4	16.7 5	7.6 6	22.7 7	21.3 8	9.1 9	
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion. N=66	40.9 1	7.6 2	9.1 3	4.5 4	12.1 5	6.1 6	7.6 7	4.5 8	7.6 9	
4. Student bothers others while they are working. N=66	24.2 1	18.6 2	18.6 3	18.6 4	12.2 5	7.6 6	6.1 7	7.6 8	4.5 9	
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination. N=65	24.6 1	12.3 2	9.2 3	7.7 4	27.7 5	7.7 6	6.2 7	4.6 8	0.0 9	
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules. N=66	24.6 1	18.5 2	14.9 3	9.2 4	12.3 5	3.1 6	10.5 7	4.6 8	6.2 9	
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time. N=65	29.0 1	14.5 2	12.5 3	10.5 4	4.6 5	4.6 6	13.5 7	3.1 8	6.2 9	

	There has been no evidence of this behavior ◆				This behavior occurs occasionally ◆			This behavior is frequent and typical ◆	
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay. N=43	7.9 1	1.6 2	4.8 3	7.9 4	7.9 5	6.3 6	17.5 7	25.4 8	20.6 9
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc. N=43	4.8 1	4.8 2	4.8 3	9.5 4	11.1 5	7.9 6	7.5 7	22.2 8	17.5 9
10. Student completes work on time and in good order. N=43	4.8 1	4.5 2	9.7 3	9.1 4	9.7 5	14.3 6	12.7 7	14.1 8	21.0 9
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her. N=43	42.9 1	28.6 2	15.9 3	1.6 4	9.5 5	1.6 6	0.0 7	3.2 8	4.8 9
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities. N=43	19.0 1	4.5 2	7.9 3	4.8 4	17.0 5	6.3 6	7.9 7	12.5 8	7.9 9

Thank you! Please fold this form so the return address shows and put in the school mail as soon as possible.

MAIL TO:

NANCY B. SCHULYER
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
ORE, BOX 79

120

Summer School Pilot Project

Appendix L

STAFF COMMENTS

Instrument Description: Staff Comments

Brief description of the instrument:

Staff impressions of the summer school were acquired through a meeting in October 1982. A list of 13 questions about summer school was used as a guide for the discussion and a note-taking aide.

To whom was the instrument administered?

One summer school teacher from reading, math, and LEP reading, two instructional coordinators, two summer school directors, two elementary directors (for management), one planner, one evaluator, and one intern.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once.

When was the instrument administered?

October 18, 1982.

Where was the instrument administered?

A meeting room in the Carruth Administration Building.

Who administered the instrument?

Evaluation staff guided the discussion as necessary, but generally discussion was self-guided.

What training did the administrators have?

Training appropriate to positions held. All had been involved in some aspect of summer school.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

Not applicable.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

No.

Who developed the instrument?

ORE evaluator for project.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

No.

Purpose

Staff Impressions

Staff impressions of the Summer School Pilot Program's (SSPP) effectiveness was formally solicited by means of the Director Survey (Appendix H) and the Teacher Survey (Appendix I) filled in at the end of the summer session. No plans were integrated into the original evaluation design to include a description of informal reactions of staff to the program after the fall session had begun. The Texas Education Agency, however, in its evaluation guidelines for districts conducting summer school pilot programs, requested that reactions to the program and recommendations for changes in the program be solicited from summer school staff after the 1982-83 school year had begun. A meeting of key staff was therefore called to gain this information.

Procedure

A meeting was held from 3:00-5:00 on Monday, October 18, 1982 at the AISD Carruth administration building to discuss the summer school. Those present included three teachers (one LEP, one reading, and one math teacher), two directors of summer schools, the language arts and math committee chairpersons (instructional coordinators), the Directors of Elementary School Curriculum and Management, an educational planner, and the evaluator and evaluation intern working on the project. Other summer school directors and the coordinator in charge of LEP curriculum were invited but were unable to attend. The agenda for the meeting is shown in Attachment L-1 along with questions addressed in assessing the summer program. The two-hour discussion was very active and resulted in a number of valuable ideas for next year. Notes were taken and the session was taped. The questions described in Attachment L-1 will be used as a framework for reporting ideas and opinions discussed at the meeting.

Results

1. How satisfied were you with the way the reading classes were set up? What did you like best? least? What would you change? (curriculum materials, material distribution, class schedule, material coverage expected, rewards, etc.)

   Materials: Problems with mastery at some grades could be related to the level of material used; e.g., the kindergarten materials might be better suited to first-graders' skills than the first-grade materials. Reading teacher: At the third-grade level, the Sequencing unit should be dropped and replaced with one or two Inference units as required material. More Inference units might help students' performance on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). The Sequencing Unit taught an artificial process that didn't teach comprehension directly nor other necessary skills for reading.

All "reteach" materials should be checked since mastery levels were lower than expected at some grades. More "fun" books might be purchased next year (e.g., Monsters, Random Books, Reading Bookshop), and more beginning reading books. Any skills with low mastery levels should be reviewed. Coordinators should meet with more teachers to get ideas for possible changes for next year's summer school.

Time Allotment: Ms. Steinberg, the reading teacher present, reported that class time allotted was fine and that having an extra 45 minutes beyond the time allotted for the Chicago Mastery Learning System (CMLR) allowed teachers to structure additional instruction as they saw fit. This variety made 1½ hours for reading reasonable.

Reinforcers: Ms. Steinberg reported that the scented stickers were very good motivators. Her third-graders read three to four books per week, which she did not think was typical of these students.

2. How did math classes work out? What did you like? Dislike? What improvements could be made? (curriculum materials, material distribution, class schedule, rewards, individualized instruction, etc.)

Materials: Thermofax masters and other material normally secured through the warehouse were unavailable. The one box supplied was often not sufficient. The suggestion was made that the warehouse be notified of summer school needs at the last time material requests are put in during the school year. Generally, the skill levels of the materials seemed appropriate for the students, although some students had difficulties with number concepts.

Time Allotment: Mr. Baylor, the math teacher present, felt that the allotted time was well delineated and not rushed. There was plenty of time to cover the material. He believed his students were better in math than in reading, and the possibility of reducing allotted math time or even eliminating it might be considered. However, Ms. Hunt (a director) observed that students seemed happier in math, perhaps because it was easier to meet with success. Ms. Uphaus (coordinator of the math curriculum committee) felt this feeling of success was important, and that ways of getting this enthusiasm to carry over to reading should be sought. One way might be for the teacher to have the same students and teach both subjects. Ms. Steinberg mentioned that there should really be a chance for higher scores on the ITBS in math since 1½ hours was more time than the students got during the year of daily math. Thus, they really had the equivalent of nearly 10 weeks of math instruction during the regular school year.

At least one teacher who taught both reading and math liked it better. Others liked sticking to one subject.

3. How did the community school work out? What changes would you suggest?

   Directors and teachers commented that the break was necessary and very beneficial for the students and teachers affectively. However, instead of having one hour of planning time, there was really only a half-hour of planning time due to supervision needs for bathroom break, snack time, etc. Some supervision problems encountered during the community school time might be reduced with more staff to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio. Staggering the break at some schools helped reduce group sizes.

4. How did enrollment procedures work out? What changes might help?

   This issue generated much discussion. The general consensus of meeting participants was that enrollment must be closed early, perhaps at a pre-specified number of students (e.g., the first 800 enrolled) or by a pre-specified date. Late enrollment had detrimental effects on staff development, planning activities, enrollment paperwork, transportation, supplies, class activities, and performance of teachers and students added late. While definite retention notifications must be made before the last three weeks of school, participants noted that, in most cases, teachers know well before the last three weeks those they are likely to recommend for retention. Conferences with the parents of these children could be held well before the last three weeks and pre-enrollment arrangements could be made. At any rate, participants agreed that enrollment must close at least one week before school ends. Many participants thought enrollment should be limited only to those retained the year summer school is held, although some thought the program would perform a greater service if opened to all low-achieving students or at least to those being considered for retention. Allowing anyone strongly considered for retention to enroll would make it easier to have enrollment close earlier.

5. How did the procedures work out for assigning students to schools? Classes? Bus Routes? For notifying parents of this information?

   The work of the Transportation Department was excellent and transportation in general was very good, but the bus rides were very long for some kids. Some participants suggested that more buses of a smaller size with more routes be used. Apparently, some parents did not have information about bus routes: some children waited at the bus stop they used during the year. Perhaps a small map on the letter home of where the bus stop is (rather than just description) would help the parents. The process might be simplified if route assignments were computerized; many of these problems would be reduced if summer school students were known at least one week before the start of classes. Participants noted that "previous" retainees were often difficult to place in classes and that the regular teacher might suggest a functional level for these students.

6. Did teachers receive enough information about their students this year through the student data cards? Were phone calls to former teachers or home visits helpful? What information should teachers receive next year? (Strengths and weaknesses sheets, ITBS skills analyses)

   The general consensus of meeting participants was that teachers needed the strengths and weaknesses sheets filled out by the spring teacher of all retainees starting in 1981-82. A carbonless, pressure-sensitive, three-part form could be used this year to make this easier to accomplish. One part could remain in the child's folder and another could be sent to the summer school teachers. This sheet might be more helpful than phone calls to teachers since they sometimes didn't remember the child's specific problems or felt they had filled out the sheets and they weren't used to maximum benefit. Some teachers also were not told by their principals that they might be called. They need to be notified of this if calls are to be made again. Also, teachers' names and home phone numbers must be added to the Student Data Card filled in by the regular school year teacher.

7. How did record-keeping go? What changes might be helpful next year?

   Secretaries need to start a few days to a week ahead of time to help with all the paperwork necessary before school begins.

8. Were teachers adequately prepared through inservice this year? Would any changes in procedures or offerings help next year?

   The consensus of participants was that the late enrollment, necessitating the hiring of additional teachers late, created difficulties in teacher preparation for summer school. In-service activities had to be offered twice to accommodate these extra teachers, and some teachers were hired so late that they did not attend either in-service and had to be helped individually as well as possible. Some of these teachers received incomplete information. The in-service for reading teachers would be improved if it included a "walk-through" of a CMLR lesson, and if teachers had a chance to review materials first.

9. How did planning work out? Not discussed specifically.

10. How did the follow-up activities work out? Should they be continued next year? In the same way? Who should be responsible for this?

    Developing instructions for follow-up and distributing follow-up materials took a great deal of time. Funding for an individual to distribute these materials should be added to the grant application next year.

11. What were the biggest strengths of the program this year?

    The biggest strengths mentioned by staff members were: the enthusiastic staff, the positive attitude of staff, and the reinforcers built into the program. Participants also noted that class observations indicated that very little class time was spent in "class control" activities (e.g., corrective activities for rule-breaking).

12. Which aspects of the program need the most improvement? What could be done?

    Two major improvements are needed according to the participants: 1) enrollment must be cut off early to avoid many other problems, and 2) improvements must be made in the records sent to summer school teachers; this includes getting skill strengths and weaknesses sheets to teachers and adding the students' previous teacher's name and phone number to the Student Data Card.

13. In general, how did you feel about the summer school program for retainees?

    The participants agreed that the summer school was a very worthwhile project. Many students seemed to show increased interest in reading. Attendance was high, and the incentives seemed to help both attendance and enthusiasm.

14. General Comments:

    Participants mentioned that the large numbers of special education students enrolled in summer school created some problems that might be avoided by having the student's "skill level" listed on the Student Data Card, and possibly by having some special education personnel on campus. About 15% of summer school teachers held certification for special education, although this was not a factor in selecting teachers for this year's summer school. Perhaps these teachers could be used as resources for other summer school teachers.

    One assistant principal had notified one of the participants to say that the students who had attended summer school were doing "much better" this fall.

LEP Reading Materials - Cathy Colunga, who taught first and second grade LEP students, reported that many of the first-grade students had limited English and Spanish. Of 14 Spanish first-grade students, six did not know the Spanish alphabet and were functioning on a pre-K or kindergarten level. In speculating on why these children had such poor skills, Cathy noted that attendance during summer school was very low for some of the students who had the poorest skills which may have been true during the regular year as well. Self-concept and social problems caused by differences in the home and school environments might also contribute. Cathy's second-grade students, on the other hand, were good readers. She felt the LEP materials provided much needed flexibility in meeting student needs. She felt the structure provided was fairly limited but thought this was beneficial.

AGENDA

SUMMER SCHOOL

1.	Summary of Evaluation Findings thus far	John MacDonald
2.	Strength and Weaknesses of This Year's Program	Nancy Baenen-Group Discussion
3.	Grant Possibilities for 1983 Summer School	Joan Burnham

QUESTIONS - SUMMER SCHOOL IMPRESSIONS

1. How satisfied were you with the way the reading classes were set up? What did you like best? least? What would you change? (curriculum materials, materials' distribution, class schedule, material coverage expected, rewards, etc.)

2. How did the math classes work out? What did you like? dislike? What improvements could be made? (curriculum materials, materials' distribution, class schedule, rewards, individualized instruction, etc.)

3. How did the community school segment work out? What changes would you suggest?

4. How did enrollment procedures work out? What changes might help?

5. How did the procedures work out for assigning students to schools? Classes? Bus routes? For notifying parents of this information?

6. Did teachers receive enough information about their students this year through the student data cards? Were phone calls to former teachers or home visits helpful? What information should teachers receive next year? (Strengths and weaknesses sheets, ITBS skills analyses)

7. How did record-keeping go? What changes might be helpful next year?

8. Were teachers adequately prepared through inservice this year? Would any changes in procedures or offerings help next year?

9. How did planning work out this year? Would any changes in responsibilities or procedures help next year?

10. How did the followup activities work out? Should they be continued next year? In the same way? Who should be responsible for this?

11. What were the biggest strengths of the program this year?

12. Which aspects of the program need the most improvement? What could be done?

13. In general, how did you feel about the summer school program for retainees?

Summer School Pilot Project

Appendix M

LONG-TERM COMPARISON GROUP

82.25 Instrument Description: Long-Term Comparison Group

Brief description of the data file:

Students retained at the end of the 1981-82 and 1980-81 school years who attended the 1982 summer school were matched with students with similar characteristics who did not attend summer school. The file includes students' names, identification numbers, 1981-82 program services, demographic characteristics, and Reading and Math Total scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) for 1981-82.

Which students or other individuals are included on the file?

Students retained at the end of 1981-82 and 1980-81 who attended summer school and took the spring 1982 ITBS and similar retainee matches.

How often is information on the file added, deleted, or updated?

Once when spring 1983 ITBS scores are available.

Who is responsible for changing or adding information to the file?

ORE, although some information used to build the file is the responsibility of other departments.

How was the information contained on the file gathered?

Information was taken from the Student Master File, Title I, Title I Migrant, LEP, Special Education, and ITBS files.

Are there problems with the information on the file that may affect the validity of the data?

None that are known.

What data are available concerning the accuracy and reliability of the information on the file?

Original tape files and school records could be checked although this would be very time-consuming.

Are there normative or historical data available for interpreting the results?

ITBS national norms and AISD averages can be used for comparison.

Brief description of the file layout:

See Attachment M-1.

LONG-TERM COMPARISON GROUP

Purpose

A comparison group had to be chosen which would enable an assessment of the impact of the summer school on retainees' reading and math skills. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) reading and math skills emphasized in summer school were chosen to assess the impact. This appendix describes the way in which this comparison group was chosen.

Procedure

Retainees who attended summer school were matched with retainees who did not attend summer school. Retainees were matched on Title I, Title I Migrant, Limited English Proficiency, and Special Education service to control for program services on which students might vary. In addition, students were matched on sex, ethnicity, age, and grade. On program service, retainees were only matched if they were or were not served by exactly the same programs in 1981-82. Students had to be of the same sex, the same ethnicity (Hispanic, Black, or Other) and the same grade. They also had to be no more than one year older or younger than each other. Reading Total and Math Total ITBS scores were matched as closely as possible after these matches on all other characteristics were done. The program forced a match with the student with the next highest or next lowest score on an alternating basis. If no match could be found within six grade equivalent months of the summer school retainees' score, the student was dropped from the sample. This limit was increased to nine months for students in grades 4 - 6 in 1981-82 only because up to 50% of some grade-level groups were lost with the six-month limit.

All summer school students who were retained in 1981-82 and 1980-81 were considered for the sample. This included 697 of the 1,141 students (61.1%) who had identification numbers. Of these, 551 students had been retained in 1981-82 and 146 had been retained in 1980-81. The rest of the students had either been retained in 1979-80 (4.7% or 54 students) or before (34.2% or 390 students). These students were not included in the sample since it would have been very difficult to match 1979-80 retainees on program service over a period of several years and retention status information was not available on students retained prior to 1979-80.

A number of retainees who attended summer school did not have spring 1982 ITBS scores in reading and/or math and were therefore eliminated from the sample. Reading and math samples were pulled independently. The final number considered for each sample was:

Math (1980-81 retainees) 105
Reading (1980-81 retainees) 101
Math (1981-82 retainees) 425
Reading (1981-82 retainees) 393.

Results

The actual number of students who were matched through this selection process in reading and math is shown in Figures M-1 and M-2. These figures also show the mean, standard deviation, and range of grade equivalent scores for the groups by grade.

As Figure M-1 shows, 93 of the 101 1980-81 retainees considered for the reading sample were matched. Of the 393 1981-82 retainees considered, 272 were matched. The increase at grade 4 - 6 of the achievement limit only increased the match rate by two students, so almost all students' scores are within six grade-equivalent months of each other. Means, standard deviations, and ranges of scores are generally very close to each other, with no systematic favoritism of one group or the other.

Figure M-2 shows that 93 of the 105 1980-81 and 294 of the 425 1981-82 retainees considered for the math sample matched. The increased limit of nine grade equivalent months for the 1981-82 retainees did increase the match rate by 26 students. Again, means, standard deviations, and score ranges for the two groups are fairly close to one another.

Obviously, since students were matched on grade, age, sex, ethnicity, and program service, the percentage of each group with these characteristics is the same.

READING -- 1980-81

	RETAINEES IN SUMMER SCHOOL				RETAINEES NOT IN SUMMER SCHOOL			
GRADE	N	MEAN	SD	RANGE	N	MEAN	SD	RANGE
2	38	1.73	.59	.7-2.9	38	1.72	.59	.6-2.9
3	26	1.97	.68	.7-3.3	26	1.95	.64	.8-3.2
4	11	2.95	.40	2.3-3.5	11	2.91	.43	2.2-3.6
5	7	4.44	.55	3.7-5.1	7	4.37	.46	3.8-5.1
6	8	4.83	.41	4.3-5.4	8	4.89	.23	4.5-5.3
Total	93							

READING -- 1981-82

GRADE	N	MEAN	SD	RANGE	N	MEAN	SD	RANGE
1	121	1.03	.35	.1-2.0	121	1.04	.35	.1-1.9
2	52	1.51	.40	.80-3.1	52	1.56	.46	.5-2.9
3	29	2.36	.59	1.1-3.5	29	2.42	.56	1.4-3.6
4	32	2.91	.73	1.7-4.7	32	2.92	.78	1.6-4.7
5	33	4.05	.91	2.1-6.4	33	4.05	.88	2.3-6.3
6	5	4.50	.44	3.9-5.5	5	4.64	.51	4.3-5.5
Total	272							

Figure M-1. LONG-TERM COMPARISON GROUP—READING. Shows number of retainees attending and not attending summer school who were matched by grade.

MATH — 1980-81

	RETAINEES IN SUMMER SCHOOL				RETAINEES NOT IN SUMMER SCHOOL			
GRADE	N	MEAN	SD	RANGE	N	MEAN	SD	RANGE
2	39	1.89	.47	1.2-2.9	39	1.87	.43	1.2-2.8
3	30	2.28	.49	1.4-3.2	30	2.40	.45	1.6-3.2
4	10	3.24	.28	2.4-4.2	10	3.22	.47	2.6-3.9
5	7	4.44	.59	3.3-5.2	7	4.27	.64	3.0-5.0
6	7	4.77	.37	4.0-5.1	7	4.59	.41	4.0-5.1
Total	93							

MATH — 1981-82

1	122	1.19	.38	.2-2.3	122	1.18	.39	.3-2.9
2	55	2.04	.41	1.3-3.3	55	2.07	.37	1.4-3.1
3	35	2.73	.46	1.9-4.0	35	2.88	.42	2.1-3.9
4	37	3.31	.52	2.2-4.4	37	3.31	.60	2.3-4.7
5	39	4.35	.80	2.5-5.9	39	4.35	.74	2.8-5.9
6	6	4.62	.51	3.9-5.3	6	4.65	.69	3.6-5.5
Total	294							

Figure M-2. LONG-TERM COMPARISON GROUP--MATH. Shows number of retainees attending and not attending summer school who were matched by grade.

Summer School Pilot Project

Appendix N

MASTERY TESTS REVISED

82.25 Instrument Description: Mastery Tests Revised

Brief description of the instrument:

Students' mastery of reading objectives was assessed through tests in the Chicago Mastery Learning System (CMLR). Math mastery was measured through tests in the Math for Everyone series. Problems with coding and keypunching were discovered which necessitated rerunning of these analyses (first reported in Appendix F of ORE Report Letter 82-F).

To whom was the instrument administered?

All students present for the instruction in each skill unit.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Formative tests were given after basic instruction for each unit. Students who did not master the skill received additional instruction and were retested with a summative test. The number of units/skills varied by grade level.

When was the instrument administered?

Formative tests were given after initial basic instruction in each skill unit. Summative tests were given after additional instruction for those who did not show mastery initially.

Where was the instrument administered?

In summer school classrooms.

Who administered the instrument?

Classroom teachers.

What training did the administrators have?

Three days of inservice on use of materials--including tests and recording sheets. Manuals were also provided. A few teachers who were added late did not receive complete inservice training.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No, although all teachers had the same instructions and materials.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

Problems were discovered and corrected after the first report was issued which are detailed within this appendix. Records at some grade levels are incomplete. A few teachers' records had to be "interpreted" which was hopefully done correctly.

Who developed the instrument?

CMLR materials were developed by the Board of Education, City of Chicago Public Schools. Math for Everyone was developed by Region XIII, Education Service Center staff.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

None at present.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

Tests are criterion-referenced, with mastery standards set for each objective. CMLR has been used in other school districts, but never with retainees in a summer school setting.

MASTERY TESTS REVISED

Purpose

Mastery test results in reading and mathematics were reported in the first report to TEA (ORE Publication No. 82.04). Unfortunately, some coding/keypunching problems were discovered which affected the results. This appendix will describe the nature of the problems, the way they were dealt with, and the revised results. The primary decision and evaluation questions addressed were:

> Decision Question D4: Should retainees be encouraged to attend summer school?
>
> > Evaluation Question D4-1: Did students meet short-term objectives? How many skills were the students able to master (at an 80% level) by the end of summer school?

Procedure

The original coding system used in processing teachers' mastery records assigned students a "1" if they mastered a skill, a "2" if they were absent when a skill was taught, and a "blank" if they did not master a skill but were present for the instruction. The percent of all students mastering a skill was then calculated based on the number of students present for and mastering a skill. For the most part, this system was adequate and should have resulted in valid mastery percentages. However, some problems were discovered which generally lowered the mastery percentages in reading unfairly. These also affected the math mastery percentages slightly. The chart which follows describes the nature of the problems encountered and the way they were dealt with. Once all coding errors were corrected, mastery percentages for reading and math were recalculated using the original program.

PROBLEM	SOLUTION
1. Results for some students were never coded. These students were counted as "nonmasters" in the analyses since a "blank" indicated a student had not mastered an objective. Teachers' records for these classes were missing. This affected one class at grade 1, five at grade 2, one at grade 3, and one at grade 6.	1. Students were given a code of "3" to indicate that results were not available. These results were not included in calculating percent mastery.

PROBLEM	SOLUTION
2. Some grade assignments were incorrect. This occurred because some students were taught on a different level in reading than in math and others were taught math on two grade levels. There was only one column for grade on the keypunch format, and keypunchers were told to alternate grade assignments listed. This was not always appropriate.	2. Separate columns for reading and math grades were created. Individual student records and class records were reviewed to determine correct grade placement. Correct codes were entered as necessary and old codes that were originally correct were added to the columns. In math, class records were reviewed to see what grade level(s) students were actually instructed on. Incorrect assignments for students taught on one level were fixed. If students were taught on more than one level, the grade and score which were "on level" for reading were used.
3. All teachers were not able to cover all of the required and optional units.	3. An attempt was made to delete these classes from the analyses the first time. Some classes were <u>not</u> skipped that should have been. These were deleted the second time.

Results

Reading

<u>Evaluation Question D4-1</u>: Did students meet short-term objectives? How many skills were the students able to master (at an 80% level) in reading and math by the end of summer school?

The short-term reading objective was that 90% of the summer school students would master the units required for their grade level at an 80% level by the end of the five-week session. This goal was not quite accomplished, although almost all units were mastered at the specified level by at least 80% of the students. The goal was met at one grade level--grade 6.

Results are shown in Figures N-1 to N-6 by grade level and unit. The chart which follows shows the percent of students mastering the units at each grade level.

PERCENT MASTERING	GRADE LEVEL 1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTAL
0-59%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
60-69%	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
70-79%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
80-89%	4	2	3	1	3	-	13
90-100%	5	3	2	5	2	6	23
TOTAL UNITS BY GRADE:	9	5	5	6	6	6	37

NUMBER OF REQUIRED UNITS MASTERED BY SPECIFIED PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS BY GRADE.

Thus, only one unit, "Topic Sentences" at grade 5, was mastered by less than 80% of the students. The next lowest percent mastery was "Imagery in Reading" at grade 2.

These corrected results are much more encouraging about the feasibility of using the CMLR system with retainees in a summer school setting. Lowering the percentage of students required to master each unit to 80 or 85%, or excluding integrated special education students from the program, or reviewing and improving the units and tests with the lowest mastery percentages might help the accomplishment of the short-term objective next year.

Math

The short-term objective for math was:

> By the end of the five-week summer school, participating retainees will, on the average, master the number of skills specified for their instructional level at an 80% level.

The mean scores and range of scores for each grade level in math are as follows:

GRADE	MEAN	RANGE	NUMBER WITH VALID SCORES
Kindergarten	73.6%	51-91	5
1	92.5%	43-100	265
2	92.4%	73-100	261
3	89.8%	64-100	187
4	87.0%	51-100	203
5	87.7%	58-100	65
6	-	-	-

MEAN MASTERY LEVELS OF SPECIFIED MATH SKILLS BY GRADE. Also indicates range of scores for students. Sixth-grade students used fifth-grade math materials.

The math objective was met. Students mastered specified skills at approximately an 87% average level overall. The only grade level at which students did not show an average mastery level of greater than 80% was at the kindergarten level. Only five students were taught with kindergarten math materials, and these were LEP students who were functioning at a very low academic level. All had very limited English and Spanish reading skills.

82.25

	GRADE: 1 WORD ATTACK/STUDY SKILLS								
	REQUIRED						OPTIONAL		
	Sight Words I 2:	Sight Words II 4:	Sight Words III 7:	Sight Words IV 9:	Compound Words 8:		Titles 4:		
NUMBER OF STUDENT RECORDS AVAILABLE	223	221	204	216	210		74		
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	213	209	218	186	179		66		
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	95.5	94.6	93.6	86.1	85.2		89.2		

	GRADE: 1 COMPREHENSION								
	REQUIRED						OPTIONAL		
	How and Why Questions 5:	Context Clues I 6:	Context Clues II 7:	Words That Describe 8:					
NUMBER OF STUDENT RECORDS AVAILABLE	215	211	199	162					
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	201	201	171	146					
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	93.5	88.2	85.9	90.1					

Figure N-1. STUDENTS MASTERING FIRST-GRADE READING UNITS. Students not exposed to the unit or for whom records were unavailable were not included.

	GRADE: 2 COMPREHENSION								
	REQUIRED						OPTIONAL		
	3: IMAGERY IN READING	4: CAUSE AND EFFECT	10: INFERENCE I	12: INFERENCE II	6: CATEGORIZING		7: SENTENCE MEANING		
NUMBER OF STUDENT RECORDS AVAILABLE	177	173	175	164	129		66		
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	141	161	169	133	127		59		
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	79.7	93.1	96.6	81.1	98.4		89.4		

Figure N-2. STUDENTS MASTERING SECOND-GRADE READING UNITS.

GRADE: 3	COMPREHENSION								
	REQUIRED						OPTIONAL		
	2: SENTENCES IN SEQUENCE	4: CAUSE AND EFFECT	5: USING CONTEXT CLUES	6: CATEGORIZING	7: SENTENCE MEANING		INFERENCE I	TITLES/MAIN IDEA	
NUMBER OF STUDENT RECORDS AVAILABLE	120	117	114	114	111		30	58	
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	105	103	109	110	94		29	57	
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	87.5	88.0	95.6	96.5	84.7		96.7	98.3	

Figure N-3. STUDENTS MASTERING THIRD-GRADE READING UNITS.

	GRADE: 4 COMPREHENSION								
	REQUIRED						OPTIONAL		
	1: CATEGORIZING	2: COMPARISONS I	4: COMPARISONS II	5: PICKING BEST ANSWER	8: CAUSE AND EFFECT	9: FACT AND OPINION	3: MAKING SENSE	10: FINDING THE RIGHT ANSWER	
NUMBER OF STUDENT RECORDS AVAILABLE	169	180	175	173	169	165	91	92	
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	166	174	160	146	156	153	90	80	
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	98.2	96.7	91.4	84.4	92.3	92.7	98.9	87.0	

Figure N-4. STUDENTS MASTERING FOURTH-GRADE READING UNITS.

	GRADE: 5 COMPREHENSION								
	REQUIRED						OPTIONAL		
	1: CONTENT AND MESSAGE (INDEPENDENT ACTIVITY)	6: SEQUENCE AND PATTERNS	8: TOPIC SENTENCES	9: MAKING INFERENCES I	11: PROBLEM SOLVING	13: FACT AND OPINION	10: GLOBES	2: CHARTS	
NUMBER OF STUDENT RECORDS AVAILABLE	131	126	130	128	124	122	35	37	
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	115	106	83	110	120	120	33	33	
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	87.8	84.1	63.8	85.9	96.8	98.4	94.3	89.2	

Figure N-5. STUDENTS MASTERING FIFTH-GRADE READING UNITS.

	GRADE: 6			COMPREHENSION					
	REQUIRED						OPTIONAL		
	1:	7:	8:	11:	12:	13:	10:	4:	
	CONTENT AND MESSAGE (INDEPENDENT ACTIVITY)	STEREOTYPES	TOPIC SENTENCES	INFERENCES II	PROBLEM SOLVING	FACT AND OPINION	GLOBES	GRAPHS	
NUMBER OF STUDENT RECORDS AVAILABLE	39	23	24	24	23	23	0	0	
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	39	23	22	24	23	23			
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PASSING OBJECTIVE	100	100	91.7	100	100	100			

Figure N-6. STUDENTS MASTERING SIXTH-GRADE READING UNITS.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Ed Small, President

Manuel Navarro, Vice President

Nan Clayton, Secretary

Steve M. Ferguson

Peter W. Werner, M. D.

Larry G. Waterhouse

Abel R. Ruiz

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. John Ellis

DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Freda M. Holley